Class 220.7 Book W52
C4

General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

WESTMINSTER COMMENTARIES
EDITED BY WALTER LOCK D.D.
LADY MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY

ST MARK

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T5-CPW-181

ST MARK

WITH INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY
AND ADDITIONAL NOTES

BY

A. E. J. RAWLINSON, B.D.
STUDENT AND TUTOR OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD

METHUEN & CO. LTD.
36 ESSEX STREET W.C.
LONDON

BS
2585
.R261
1925

78790

First Published in 1925

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFATORY NOTE BY THE GENERAL EDITOR

THE primary object of these Commentaries is to be exegetical, to interpret the meaning of each book of the Bible in the light of modern knowledge to English readers. The Editors will not deal, except subordinately, with questions of textual criticism or philology; but taking the English text in the Revised Version as their basis, they will aim at combining a hearty acceptance of critical principles with loyalty to the Catholic Faith.

The series will be less elementary than the Cambridge Bible for Schools, less critical than the International Critical Commentary, less didactic than the Expositor's Bible; and it is hoped that it may be of use both to theological students and to the clergy, as well as to the growing number of educated laymen and laywomen who wish to read the Bible intelligently and reverently.

Each commentary will therefore have

(i) An Introduction stating the bearing of modern criticism and research upon the historical character of the book, and drawing out the contribution which the book, as a whole, makes to the body of religious truth.

(ii) A careful paraphrase of the text with notes on the more difficult passages and, if need be, excursuses on any points of special importance either for doctrine, or ecclesiastical organization, or spiritual life.

But the books of the Bible are so varied in character that considerable latitude is needed, as to the proportion which the various parts should hold to each other. The General Editor will therefore only endeavour to secure a general uniformity in scope and character: but the exact method adopted in each case and the final responsibility for the statements made will rest with the individual contributors.

By permission of the Delegates of the Oxford University Press and of the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press the Text used in this Series of Commentaries is the Revised Version of the Holy Scriptures.

The present Commentary deals more fully than previous Commentaries on the Gospels with textual and critical problems. It attempts to get behind the Gospel as written to the Gospel as first preached, to trace its sources, and to explain the reasons which led the first preachers to select these particular actions and sayings of the Lord. It is natural therefore that there should be much that is tentative and suggestive in it: but it deals with the problem which is central in present-day discussions of the Gospels, and will, I hope, be found to be a real contribution to its solution.

WALTER LOCK

May, 1925.

PREFACE

THE writing of this book, begun in 1918, has been pursued in such intervals of all too scanty leisure as could be snatched from other urgent duties and tasks in the course of the intervening years. I am extremely conscious that under different conditions it might have been possible to make it less inadequate, more particularly by taking account of the articles in reviews and learned journals in our own and other countries which have a bearing upon the interpretation of the Gospel. But this would have involved still further delay in publication, and further delay has seemed inexpedient. The book must go out as it is, and meet the fate at the hands of its critics which it deserves.

The plan of the series for which it has been written and in which it is included involves the taking of the English Text in the Revised Version as a basis, and precludes the assumption of a knowledge of Greek on the part of the reader. Since, however, I am not without hope that the book, though written primarily for readers of English, may be found serviceable also by those who are able to read the text in the original language, I have, with the consent of the General Editor, allowed myself occasionally to include notes of a more or less textual or philological character, in so far as this was at all possible without actual quotation of the Greek. I have also, in view of the special importance of this Gospel in relation to the modern discussion of Christian origins, attempted deliberately a somewhat fuller discussion of the critical and historical problems of the Gospel than was strictly necessitated by the general plan of the series as defined in the General Editor's Prefatory Note. I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to the General Editor both for allowing me, in these and in other ways, to depart somewhat from the precedents set in respect of form and general scope by previous volumes in the series, and also for his kindness in accepting my work, in suggesting improvements, and in working over the whole book with his accustomed care, both in typescript and in proof. I owe further a debt of sincere thanks to my father-in-law, the Rev. P. A. Ellis, for help generously given in the laborious work of verifying references and correcting proofs.

In pursuance of the rule that an acquaintance with English only should be assumed on the part of the reader, I have referred to and quoted from the English translations of books by French and German writers in all cases in which published English translations were available; in other cases I have given references to the French or German originals, but have made my own versions of passages selected for actual quotation.

It has been necessary at innumerable points in the course of the book to express definite judgements with regard to a large number of matters which are hotly debated. I should like it to be understood that I am very far from claiming anything approaching finality for the opinions expressed, which are in every case to be regarded as being subject to correction by the critical judgement of competent scholars, as they are also submitted, in respect of their spiritual value, to the ultimate discernment of the Christian community.

A. E. J. RAWLINSON

OXFORD, 1925.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PAGE

Chapter I. THE EARLIEST CHRISTIAN PREACHING . . xi

Chapter II. THE EARLIEST WRITTEN GOSPEL . . . xv

Chapter III. AUTHORSHIP, DATE, AND PLACE OF WRITING xxiv

Chapter IV. LANGUAGE, STYLE, VOCABULARY, TEXT . . xxxi

Chapter V. THE CRITICISM OF THE GOSPEL:

- § 1. The Relation of Mark to the other Synoptists . xxxv
- § 2. The Question of Mark's knowledge of 'Q' . . xxxviii
- § 3. Attempts to discriminate further Sources and Stages of Redaction xl
- § 4. The alleged 'Paulinism' of Mark . . . xliii
- § 5. Redactional Glosses and Interpolations . . xlv

Chapter VI. THE SUPERNATURAL ELEMENT IN THE GOSPEL xlvi

Chapter VII. THE THEOLOGY OF THE GOSPEL . . . l

Chapter VIII. THE RELIGIOUS VALUE OF THE GOSPEL . . liv

Chapter IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY lviii

COMMENTARY

S. MARK i 1–viii 27 1

A GENERAL NOTE ON MK viii 27–x 45 108

S. MARK viii 27–xii 44 111

A GENERAL NOTE ON CHAPTER xiii 177

S. MARK xiii 1–xvi 8 182

THE LONGER ENDING (xvi 9–20) 245

THE SHORTER ENDING. 248

THE FREER LOGION 248

ADDITIONAL NOTES

PAGE
(1) Mk i 1–4 250
(2) The Significance of our Lord's Baptism 251
(3) Mk i 40–45 256
(4) Sons of the Bride-Chamber (Mk ii 19) 256
(5) The demand for a 'Sign' (Mk viii 11 sqq.) 257
(6) The injunctions of Secrecy (Mk ix 9 and other passages) . . 258
(7) The Last Supper and the Crucifixion in relation to the Passover 262
(8) Mk xvi 7–8 and the lost Ending of the Gospel 267

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

The Earliest Christian Preaching

The literature of the New Testament, considered broadly, is the literature of a missionary movement—the mightiest missionary movement that the world has ever known. Behind the literature stands the Preaching, since Christianity was proclaimed as a message of Good News from God before any Christian literature existed whatsoever. And Christianity meant faith in Jesus as Messiah and Son of God. It is not difficult, on the basis of indications in the New Testament, to sum up the general contents of the earliest preaching. It presupposed a particular kind of theism, viz.: the characteristically Jewish belief in God, as the Creator, the Covenant-Deity, and the Living One: the God who was self-disclosed in history, and who was in process of working out His purpose for the world. It presupposed, further, a general acquaintance with Jewish Messianic expectations and spiritual hopes. Assuming these presuppositions, the earliest preachers of the Gospel proclaimed that the time was at hand: that the purpose of God was now at length on the very brink of being accomplished: that the Messiah was none other than Jesus, the Prophet of Nazareth, whom the chosen people, acting through their rulers, had paradoxically rejected, and by the hands of the Gentiles had crucified and slain.[1] Nevertheless, even this which had happened was itself part of the purpose of God and had come about 'according to the Scriptures':[2] God had raised up this Jesus, exalted Him to His own right hand, and made Him 'both Lord and Christ':[3] through Him, the Son of Man, whom in the very near future men might expect to witness coming in the clouds, the Judgement would be held.[4] Meanwhile—and this was the immediate and central kernel of the Message of Good News—repentance unto the remission of sins was proclaimed in His Name to them that were far off and to them that were nigh:[5] for God would have all men to be saved:[6] let them repent therefore and be baptized,[7] calling upon His Name[8]—the Name, that is, of Him whom God had made both Lord and Christ. For through Him the Spirit was now available—the Spirit that was to be poured out in renewing, transforming, and recreating power upon all flesh.[9]

The literature of a missionary movement. The earliest Preaching.

---

[1] Acts ii 23.

[2] 1 Cor xv 3.

[3] Acts ii 36.

[4] Acts xvii 31.

[5] Acts ii 39.

[6] Acts x 28 sqq.; cf. 1 Tim ii 4.

[7] Acts ii 38.

[8] Acts iv 12.

[9] Acts ii 17 sqq.

That, or something like it, was the essential content of the earliest Christian message. There might be differences in the way of expressing it, according as it was addressed primarily to Jews or primarily to Gentiles. There was for a time a serious divergence of view within the Church with regard to the question of the precise status of the Gentiles—whether or not it was necessary for them to be circumcised, and to keep the Jewish law. As time went on there came to be certain specific developments of doctrine which were in some sense peculiar to S. Paul. But as regards the essential and fundamental message of the Gospel, S. Paul is able to write (with reference to the original Apostles) 'Whether then it be I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed '.[1]

The Gospel Message presupposed by the New Testament.

The stage of oral traditions about Jesus.

The proclamation, then, of this Gospel Message, and its acceptance by the Church, as the very basis both of its faith and of its religious standing before God as the redeemed Community of the Messiah, is presupposed by the whole literature of the New Testament. It is characteristic of this state of the case that the earliest Christian writings which we possess are not 'Gospels', but the letters of a missionary, viz.: the Epistles of S. Paul. Except in the sense that the Christian Church from the beginning regarded itself as the fulfilment of Judaism, and therefore took over the Old Testament Scriptures as its own, Christianity did not originate as the religion of a Book; and for a considerable period, so long as the original witnesses of the Messiah were alive and accessible, the Church does not appear to have set itself to produce in writing anything like a systematic account of its own beginnings, or of that story of Jesus which formed the basis of its faith. The substance of the narratives and sayings which afterwards went to form the contents of the 'Gospels' circulated originally in the Church in the form of oral tradition. It is a curious fact that almost exactly a generation—some thirty to thirty-five years—appears to have elapsed between the Crucifixion of our Saviour and the production of the oldest of the four canonical Gospels.[2] It is probable that one reason may have been that the earliest Christians—like Papias, the early second-century writer who is quoted by Eusebius—were of opinion that they 'would not be so much profited' by 'what came from books' as by what came from 'the living and abiding voice'.[3] Another reason almost certainly was that, inasmuch as their minds were preoccupied by the expectation that the return of the Lord Jesus to judge the world would take place within their own generation,[4] it did not appear to them to be worth while to write books for the use of posterity.

---

[1] 1 Cor xv 11.

[2] Cf. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 495; and see below, pp. xxix sq., for A. D. 65–67 as the probable date for the composition of the Gospel.

[3] Papias, *apud* Euseb., *H. E.* iii 39, 4.

[4] Mk ix 1, xiii 30.

Interest of the Church in the story of Jesus.

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to suppose that the Church was so preoccupied by the thought of the future, and by devotion to the risen and glorified Christ, as to have lost interest in the historical story of the life of the Saviour upon earth. On the contrary, it is the great and distinguishing characteristic of Christianity (as contrasted, for example, with the so-called 'Mystery Religions' of paganism, which in some respects superficially resemble it), that its Gospel was rooted in history, and that the facts about Jesus were attested by contemporary witness. The memory of Jesus—of His words, of His deeds, and of the whole impression of His personality—was ineradicable from the minds and hearts of those who had known Him in the days of His flesh. To them He had been (even though at the time they had only partially understood Him) the very incarnation and embodiment of supreme religious and moral authority, as well as the Master whom they loved. They proclaimed not only the Gospel of His Messiahship, of His Death, and of His Resurrection and Exaltation; they proclaimed also the story of His mighty acts, of His deeds of mercy to the sick and the afflicted, and the sayings and parables by which He had set forth 'the mystery of the Kingdom',[1] and the true ideal of human life. It is probable that as the Church expanded, and the Gospel was carried from city to city in the Graeco-Roman world, a tradition as to the sayings and deeds of Jesus, based ultimately upon the oral teaching of the Apostles, would tend to crystallize in each of the leading centres of Christian missionary work—Jerusalem, Caesarea, Antioch, and eventually Rome. Especially would this be the case with regard to the *teaching* of Jesus, since, as J. Weiss has pointed out, the ideal of life which was everywhere set before Christian converts was that of 'living in accordance with the words of the Lord'.[2] Even for S. Paul, who had not known Jesus in the days of His flesh, the authority of a saying of Jesus was the highest authority which he could quote; only when he 'has no commandment of the Lord' does he venture to give his own judgement, even though he believes that he is inspired by the Spirit of God.[3] It is probable that in respect of the teaching of Jesus, as embodied in His parables and sayings, the sources employed by the compilers of our canonical Gospels were based on the traditions of more Churches than one, and that in respect of their contents the documents to a certain extent overlapped. Canon Streeter is of opinion that in Greek-speaking Churches collections of the sayings and parables of Jesus would be made in writing, with a view to the instruction of converts, at a very early date; and he believes that a great deal of the matter peculiar to S. Luke was derived from the tradition of the Church at Caesarea; that the document 'Q', used in common by Mt and Lk, represents the tradition of Antioch; that the matter peculiar to Mt is derived, in the

The leading centres of historical tradition.

---

[1] Mk iv 11.
[2] J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, pp. 56 sqq.
[3] 1 Cor vii 25, 40: cf. M. Goguel, *Introduction au Nouveau Testament* i, p. 41.

main, from the tradition of the Church at Jerusalem; but that all of these sources, in all likelihood, at some points overlapped.[1]

The pre-literary stage of the Gospel tradition.

A great deal has been written in recent years with regard to what may be described as the pre-literary stage in the history of the Gospel tradition.[2] What appears to emerge as the most probable conclusion is that—apart from the story of the Passion and Resurrection, which constituted the fundamental basis of the Apostolic proclamation of the Gospel—the material now included in the four canonical Gospels circulated, not as a continuous story, but in the form of anecdotes, short sayings and apophthegms, illustrative stories setting forth the attitude of Jesus towards particular types of people or towards particular problems, typical scenes from the life of the Saviour, typical or specially remarkable stories of His miracles. The *teaching* of Jesus seems to have been remembered partly in the form of isolated *logia* (i. e. sayings divorced from their original context); partly in the form of short narratives of which the point was that they culminated in a striking or typical saying of Jesus, evoked by the circumstances; so especially in the case of the stories of conflict or controversy between our Lord and His opponents—the Christian tradition recalled more particularly such cases of 'conflict' as had a bearing upon still living controversies between the Church and the Synagogue, or upon such questions as that of the obligation or non-obligation of the Law, a subject with regard to which there had been divergence of view amongst Christians themselves.

Devices to aid the memory.

There are clear traces of various mnemonic devices—e. g. *the sayings were grouped under topics or heads.* Thus prophetic or apocalyptic sayings were grouped together (Mk xiii and parallels); or sayings adapted to serve as the instructions of a missionary were remembered as such (Mt x 5–16; cf. Lk ix 1–6, x 1–16, Mk vi 7–11); or again, collections of parables were made, such as those in Mk iv,[3] Mt xiii, Lk xv and xvi; or the sayings were grouped in discourses which perhaps were meant to be known by heart—e. g. the nucleus of Mt's Sermon on the Mount (Mt v 2 sqq.), with which cf. Lk's Sermon on the Plain (Lk vi 20 sqq.). A quite different device was *the grouping together of sayings, as an aid to the memory, not on the ground of their contents, but on the ground of the recurrence of some striking keyword,* which seems to have served as an associative link (for examples see Mk ix 33–37, 41–50, and Commentary *ad loc.*). The occurrence at one or two points in Mk of what appear to be parallel versions of the same, or of similar, traditions, suggests further the hypothesis that certain *groups of episodes* may, at an early stage in the process of oral transmission, have been traditionally associated together.[1]

---

[1] B. H. Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 230 sqq.

[2] The most important works, apart from those already cited, are J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium* (1903); K. L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (1919); M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (1919); R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (1921). Cf. also Streeter in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, Essay VII.

[3] The parables in Mk iv are in all probability extracted from a much larger collection—see Commentary *ad loc.*

Motives determining the selection of traditions.

Of the motives which determined the selection of the particular anecdotes and sayings which have come down to us out of the 'many other things'[2] that Jesus said and did which must have been within the recollection of the original Apostles, we are only able to speak by way of conjecture. No doubt those episodes tended to survive from which spiritual lessons could most easily be drawn, i. e. those which were most readily adapted to serve as a basis of Christian preaching. The selection of others was doubtless determined by the necessities of early Christian apologetic and polemic, or by their bearing upon the edification and discipline of the Church, or by the fact that they could be interpreted as fulfilments of O.T. prophecy.[3] Attention has been drawn also by Menzies to what may be described as the 'aetiological motive'—the Church, that is to say, was desirous of knowing the origins (for example) of Baptism, or of the Eucharist, or again of the Apostolate.[4] Goguel refers to the 'triple interest' which attached to what tradition recalled of the work and personality of Christ, viz.: a *theological* interest, inasmuch as the Church's doctrine could never ignore the part played by the earthly life of Jesus in the drama of redemption; a *human* interest—those who had been directly or indirectly in contact with the personality of Jesus could never allow His memory to fade; and a *moral* interest, inasmuch as the words and the deeds of Jesus were regarded as supplying the key to the solution of the moral and practical problems confronting the Church.[5]

Thus (in the words of Goguel), 'the Church, from the time of its beginning, had need of traditions with regard to the life of Jesus, but a fragmentary tradition sufficed. To such a situation correspond, for example, the Epistles of S. Paul, which imply a knowledge of a number of details of the evangelical story, but not a coherent, organic, and systematic tradition as regards our Lord's life.'[6]

CHAPTER II

The Earliest Written Gospel

S. Mark the earliest written Gospel.

It is the one absolutely assured result of a century of learned discussion with regard to the origin and mutual relations of the Four Gospels that S. Mark's is the oldest written Gospel which we possess, if only for the reason that the compilers of Mt and Lk both made use of it as one of their sources.[7] It may further be regarded as reasonably certain that the Gospel was written at Rome, that the date was shortly after the deaths of S. Peter and S. Paul, as tradition affirms (but before A.D. 70), and that the author was in all probability John Mark.[1] A point had been reached in the history of the Church at which there was a demand—or, at least, a need—for just such a book as Mk has written. For the Church had known persecution. The great Apostles had passed away. And the End was not yet. It was essential to the future welfare of the Church that she should possess in writing a record of the fundamental historic facts upon which her faith was based.

---

[1] For examples see the notes on viii 1–9 and x 35–40.

[2] Jn xxi 25.

[3] Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

[4] Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 15.

[5] Goguel, *op. cit.*, pp. 41–42.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[7] The statement in the text may be verified for himself by any student who

The author's qualifications.

And S. Mark was well fitted for the task. His mother's house was in Jerusalem (Acts xii 12). It is not impossible that he may even himself have seen and known the Lord Jesus in the days of His flesh (see notes on xiv 51-52). The Christian tradition does not, however, claim that he had himself been an eyewitness of the events which he records, but only that he had been the companion of eyewitnesses.[2] As the son of the lady in whose house the original Church at Jerusalem had assembled, as a companion in missionary work of S. Paul,[3] and at a subsequent date of S. Peter,[4] and as a Christian of long standing in the first generation of Christians, he would have access to good—and indeed, to first-hand—Apostolic tradition. His book is the kind of book which such a man might be expected to write. But it is important that it should be judged for what it is, not for what it is not. It is a 'Gospel', and not a biography. It is based on Apostolic tradition. But it is written with the needs of the immediate situation in view. And the immediate situation is the situation in Rome under Nero.

The nature of his book.

The situation in Rome. The persecution under Nero.

What had happened at Rome is described in a brief but terrible passage in Tacitus' *Annals.* There had broken out at Rome in A.D. 64 a great fire in which half or more of the city was destroyed, and it was rumoured that the Emperor himself had played the incendiary. 'Therefore', writes Tacitus, 'to dispel the report Nero made a scapegoat of others, and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, whom the populace called Christians. The Christus from whom the name had its origin

---

examines the mutual relations of the three narratives in a Synopsis which prints the texts of Mt, Mk, and Lk in parallel columns. The best Synopsis in English is that of J. M. Thompson (Oxford, 1910); for those who can read the Greek text the best is A. Huck, *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien*, which can be used without a knowledge of German.

[1] For the justification of these statements see the next chapter.

[2] See the fragment from Papias, discussed in the next chapter.

[3] Acts xii 25 sqq. In view of the incident of Acts xiii 13 S. Paul declines his company on a later occasion, and he appears to have worked with Barnabas in Cyprus (Acts xv 37–39). For his later association once more with S. Paul at Rome cf. Col iv 10, Philem 24, 2 Tim iv 11.

[4] 1 Pet v 13.

had been executed during the reign of Tiberius by the procurator Pontius Pilate. The mischievous superstition was thus checked for the moment, but was reviving again, not only in Judaea, the original seat of the evil, but even in the capital, where all that is anywhere hideous or loathsome finds its centre and flourishes. Accordingly some were first put on trial; they pleaded guilty, and upon information gathered from them a large number were convicted, not so much on the charge of arson as because of their hatred of humanity. Wanton cruelty marked their execution. Covered with the skins of wild beasts, they were torn in pieces by dogs, and thus perished; many were crucified, or burned alive, and even set on fire to serve as an illumination by night, after daylight had expired. Nero had offered his own gardens for the spectacle, and exhibited races, mingling with the crowd in the garb of a charioteer, or himself driving. Hence, even for criminals who deserved extreme and exemplary punishment, there arose a feeling of compassion; for it was not, it seemed, for the common weal, but to glut the cruelty of one man, that they were being destroyed.'[1] Among the victims of Nero, according to a trustworthy tradition, were S. Peter and S. Paul.[2]

The Gospel addressed to a Martyr Church.

It is these facts which go far to explain the peculiar character of the Gospel according to S. Mark. The bearing, for example, of the Apocalyptic Chapter XIII upon the events of the time is quite clear. The fundamental message to the Church is to the effect that, though *all these things* have indeed been foreseen (xiii 4, 23), nevertheless, *the end is not yet* (xiii 7). Not yet is the hour of the Great Tribulation (xiii 19), when the stars shall fall (xiii 25). Not yet is the Manifestation of the Antichrist (xiii 14). *The Gospel must first be preached unto all the nations* (xiii 10)—the Church is recalled to her missionary task.

So, again, the Gospel is full of the echoes of martyrdom. The central section of the book—the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem (viii 27–x 45)—is already in principle a *Via Dolorosa.* The Lord goes up to Jerusalem as to a city predestined to reject Him—and so it comes to pass. Meanwhile the way of discipleship is set forth as itself also the way of the Cross (viii 34 sqq.). The death of Jesus is the Absolute Martyrdom, which avails as *a ransom for many* (x 45). But those who would follow Jesus in the way must themselves also be prepared for the possibility of martyrdom. The solemn question of Jesus to the two sons of Zebedee (x 38) confronts all would-be disciples—*Are ye able?*

---

[1] Tacitus, *Annals* xv 44. I borrow the excellent translation from Prof. E. T. Merrill's *Essays in Early Christian History*, pp. 83–84.

[2] Clem. Rom. *ad Corinth.* v 4, 5. Prof. Merrill has proposed an impossibly late date for Clement's Epistle (which was actually written about A.D. 96), as part of his thesis (*op. cit.*, pp. 267 sqq.) that S. Peter was never in Rome. His arguments are adequately answered by Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, p. 490).

Its twofold purpose.

The bearing of this upon the method of its interpretation.

The Gospel, in short, is at once a record of the story of Jesus, an account of how *the Good News about Jesus Christ the Son of God* historically began, and a message addressed to the contemporary Church. I have attempted, in writing the Commentary, to keep both points in mind; that is to say, I have tried, in relation to each saying or anecdote contained in the Gospel, to ask myself not one question only, but two, viz.: (1) How is this saying or anecdote intelligible, considered in relation to its historical origin, i. e. in the setting and context of the life of the Saviour in Palestine? and, (2) What meaning would it have in its context as incorporated in a Gospel addressed to the Christians of Rome under Nero? There is a third question, of course, which is equally important, and it is this, viz.: What is the meaning of this anecdote or saying, considered as a part of Holy Scripture, an utterance of the Spirit addressed to ourselves, and to the Church of all time? But this latter question is one to which the answer must largely be discovered by individuals for themselves in meditation, and through the use of the Gospel in the Church.[1]

The Gospel a new form of literature.

Neither precisely a 'Memoir',

Attention has been drawn by J. Weiss[2] to the fact that in writing this Gospel S. Mark was really initiating a new form of literature. The Apologist Justin Martyr endeavoured to make the nature of the 'Gospels' intelligible to educated pagans by describing them as 'memoirs'.[3] It was the best he could do, the nearest pagan literary type under which he could range them: but the term does not quite fit. It was an essential characteristic of the 'Memoir Literature' of antiquity (the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon is an example) that the author's personality was prominent. The writer of a book of 'Memoirs' begins by explaining that he was present himself personally as a witness of the events or as a hearer of the conversations which he records: or if he records also the reminiscences which he has gathered from others, he gives commonly the source from which he has learnt them, or distinguishes what thus came to him at second-hand from what he remembered himself. There is nothing of this in the Gospel. The book is anonymous. The writer's personality is nowhere obtruded. He disappears, as it were, behind his materials. He is the author of a 'Gospel', of which he does not claim to be in any personal sense the author. What he records is simply the tradition of the Church.

nor precisely a 'Biography'.

And just as the term 'Memoirs', taken strictly and applied to the Gospel, does not fit, so neither does the term 'Biography'. S. Mark has indeed been called the initiator or inventor of the 'biography type' of Gospel,[4] but the phrase is misleading. The Evangelist is not a biographer, either in the ancient or in the modern sense of the words. A biographer writes for a public which is supposed to know nothing to begin with about the person whose 'life' is being written. He begins, therefore, by introducing his hero to the reader—by saying something about his family, his birth, his childhood and education, his personal appearance, his characteristics, and proceeds, in so far as his materials allow, to give an orderly account of the course of his life. Quite otherwise is the procedure of S. Mark. He introduces his personages—the Baptist, our Lord Himself, *Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon* (i 16), *James the son of Zebedee and John his brother* (i 19), quite immediately into the story, without any explanation, as those who are already well known. He is writing for Christians, to whom his main story, with the necessary clues for the clear understanding of the narrative, may be presumed to be familiar; and he writes in a religious, and not in a biographical interest. It has been noticed as a somewhat remarkable fact, when we think of it, that neither S. Mark nor any other of the Evangelists gives any description of the personal appearance of Jesus. A description either of the personal appearance or of the character of the hero, or of both, was a regular element in ancient biographical writing. There is nothing of this in the Gospels. Even the character of our Lord is not described: it is allowed simply to disclose itself in His words and in His deeds.

---

[1] See, however, Chapter VIII, pp. liv sqq.

[2] *Das älteste Evangelium*, pp. 5 sqq.

[3] Justin, *Apol.* i 65–67.

[4] Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*, 2nd edit., p. 128; and B. H. Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 496.

Modern attempts to write our Lord's 'Life'.

The modern interest in biographical writing has given rise to innumerable attempts to write a 'Life of our Lord'—based, of course, upon the materials of the Gospels. But the Gospels do not really afford the materials for such an attempt. They tell only the essential story of the Passion and Resurrection, with just sufficient information by way of preface to set forth the kind of Person our Lord was, the kind of things He did, the kind of things He was accustomed to say, His choice of the Apostles, His parables and teaching, and the conflicts which arose between Jesus and the Jewish authorities, which led up to His death. They tell the story of His baptism and Messianic Call: S. Luke has one story of His boyhood, S. Luke and S. Matthew have each a narrative of His birth and infancy. But that is all. There is sufficient material for an historical Portrait of Jesus, sufficient material for a Gospel about Him, but not for a 'Life' in the modern biographical sense of the word.

The 'Marcan hypothesis'.

Modern 'Lives' of the Saviour, ever since the days of Theodor Keim,[1] have for the most part been written upon the basis of what is known as the 'Marcan hypothesis', i.e. upon the assumption that S. Mark, as the earliest of our Gospels, has preserved, at least in outline, the true historical framework, not indeed of our Lord's life, but of His ministry and public activity.[2] The attempt has been made to distinguish a period of relative success and popularity in Galilee, then the growth of opposition and the 'crisis of the ministry', the retirement from Herod's dominions, the episode of Caesarea Philippi, the journey to Jerusalem, the events of the Last Week, and the Crucifixion. Not infrequently it has been thought possible to trace also an inner development in the course of the story—either a development in the ideas of the disciples about their Master, on the assumption (derived surely rather from Mt xvi 15 sqq. than from Mk viii 29 sqq.) that S. Peter's confession of faith at Caesarea signalized the first realization by any disciple that Jesus was or might be the Messiah, or even (according to some expositors) a development in the ideas of the Saviour Himself about His Person and Mission. It is the conviction of the present editor, as the Commentary will make plain, that no such developments are to be traced, and that such attempts to treat the Marcan arrangement of the Gospel materials as supplying an outline, in chronological order, of the course of events are profoundly mistaken. The 'Marcan hypothesis' has indeed in recent years been riddled with criticisms of the most damaging kind.

---

[1] Keim's *History of Jesus of Nazareth* was completed and published (in German) in 1872.

[2] This holds good, to a considerable extent, even of the most recent attempt to write a 'Life', viz.: Dr. Headlam's *Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ* (London, 1923), published on the day of the author's consecration as Bishop of Gloucester.

Criticism of the 'Marcan hypothesis'.

Thus, for example, it has been argued that it involves too much 'reading between the lines'; that it is, in fact, the reflection of a view with regard to the course of our Lord's Ministry which proved, indeed, singularly attractive to a whole generation of 'liberal' scholars, but which had really been formed on the basis of an inadequate understanding of the documents, and which was read into them by a sheer *tour de force*.[1] Or again, it has been pointed out that a theory which implies only a brief period of less than a year as the total duration of our Lord's public activity assumes too rapid a course of events, and that the relentless hostility of the Chief Priests at Jerusalem towards Jesus is not really intelligible on the assumption that He had never visited the city in a public capacity hitherto (cf., too, Lk xiii 34, 35), any more than Mk enables us to understand why our Lord, as He goes up to Jerusalem, is sure in advance that the journey will lead to His death, or why it is that on His arrival He finds in Jerusalem and the neighbouring villages not only enemies, but friends.[2] The most fundamental difficulty of all, however, with regard to the 'Marcan hypothesis' is just the intrinsic improbability of anything like a chronological outline of our Lord's Ministry, or an itinerary of His movements, having been preserved, throughout a whole generation of oral tradition, by a Church which was not primarily interested in such matters. It appears to be the clear upshot of the investigations to which reference has been made in the preceding chapter[1] that it is just the framework and the arrangement of the materials in our Gospels which ought to be set down to the account of the Evangelists, the materials themselves being derived from tradition.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Schweitzer: 'In order to find in Mark the Life of Jesus of which it is in search, modern theology is obliged to read between the lines a whole host of things, and those often the most important, and then to foist them upon the text by means of psychological conjecture' (*The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, E. T., p. 330); and see the discussion in Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, pp. 90 sqq.

[2] Cf. notes on xi 1-11; and see Scott Holland, *The Philosophy of Faith and the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 127 sqq.

The hypothesis breaks down.

The theories, in a word, which have been based upon a supposed 'Synoptic' or 'Marcan' chronology are now either abandoned, or are in process of abandonment, by scholars. Professor Burkitt, who at one time argued strongly in favour of the historical value of the framework of S. Mark,[3] speaks much more diffidently in a more recent publication.[4] Similarly Canon Streeter writes that 'to speak of a Synoptic chronology . . . is quite misleading. . . . Of the last journey to Jerusalem, and the events of Passion Week, Mark presents a clear, detailed, and coherent account; and this, dealing with the events of, at the outside, three weeks, occupies about one-third of the whole Gospel. The rest of the Gospel is clearly a collection of detached stories – as indeed tradition affirms it to be; and the total number of incidents recorded is so small that the gaps in the story must be the more considerable part of it. Mark probably had information which enabled him roughly to fix the position of certain outstanding incidents like Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, but the term chronology is really a misnomer in connection with a work of this character.'[5]

The true character of the Gospel.

What appears to emerge from the discussion is that the Gospel is precisely what the Church has always understood it to be, viz.: a 'Gospel', or setting forth of the Good News. It is, speaking broadly, a record in writing of that fundamental Apostolic tradition upon which, from the first, the spoken message of 'the Gospel' had been based. It is a book which was not written, in the first instance, for posterity, but for contemporary use. It is indeed hardly a 'book', in any literary sense, at all, since it was not written for publication. No copies were ever made of it by the small army of skilled scribes who were employed by the Sosii, the great contemporary publishing firm, to make copies of manuscripts for exposure for sale on the bookstalls of Rome.[6] It was intended exclusively for private circulation amongst the leaders and teachers, the missionaries and catechists, of a persecuted religious community, who would read it aloud at the gatherings of the Brotherhood for worship. Its purpose was partly to edify converts, and to satisfy a natural curiosity as to how Christianity began, and partly to supply Christian preachers with materials for missionary preaching, and partly also to furnish a kind of armoury of apologetic arguments for use in controversy with opponents, whether Jewish or heathen. It contained the account which the Church gave of its own origins, of its fundamental spiritual message, and of certain of its leading institutions and primary sacraments. It was written, as J. Weiss expresses it, 'from faith to faith',[1] and the Evangelist's motives were not primarily biographical, they were not even primarily historical;[2] they were primarily religious.[3]

---

[1] p. xiv, *supra*.

[2] This conclusion appears more particularly to have been established by the work of K. L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, already cited on p. xiv.

[3] In *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, Chap. III (1906).

[4] 'The impression I get . . . is that . . . the sequence, . . . the general scheme of the Ministry as a whole, is being constructed by the Evangelist for the first time. "Mark wrote down accurately, though not in order, all that he remembered"; is it not possible that the confused statement of Papias really implies no more than this, that no traditional sequence, no itinerary of our Lord's footsteps, was ever preserved by those who accompanied Him?' (F. C. Burkitt, *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*, 2nd edit. [1922], pp. 82 sqq.).

[5] B. H. Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 424.

[6] Horace, *Epist.* I xx 2; *De Arte Poetica*, 345.

Its historical value.

It would be a mistake to infer from this view of the Gospel that the facts of which it purports to be the record did not occur, or that the portrait of Jesus which it sets before us is not historically true. Such a conclusion could only follow if it were assumed *ab initio* that the claim made by the Christian Church that its Gospel is rooted in facts, and that its doctrine is a true interpretation of the Divine meaning of those facts, is to be regarded, on purely *a priori* grounds, as essentially false. The attempt which was made by the 'Modernists' at the beginning of the present century to cut Christianity adrift from its historical origins, by assuming an absolute divorce between facts and interpretation, is now perceived to have been fundamentally mistaken. No form of Christianity which denies the affirmation made in A.D. 325 at Nicaea, viz.: that the historical person, Jesus of Nazareth, is in His essential being eternally one with the Eternal Father, has any future before it. The faith of the very earliest generation of believers in Jesus was of such a kind as to lead, by an inevitable process, to the Nicene affirmation. But the faith originated in the facts: it did not arise out of the air: it was called forth by an actual Person. As Mr. H. G. Wood has expressed it, 'the scientific historian could not trust as reliable an account of Jesus which did not show how men came to believe in Him'.[4]

This does not, of course, mean that every incident in the Gospel must be taken as having necessarily occurred, or as having happened just precisely as it is described. Nor again does it mean that every particular saying ascribed to Jesus is of necessity a literal record of His words. What it means is that the Gospel narrative, taken broadly, is in contact with reality, and is the outcome of a generally historical tradition; that the portrait of Jesus in the Gospel, taken as a whole, is in its vivid realism a convincing portrait of One whose personality and character the Church could not have invented for itself; and that some such story, some such events, as those which are recorded in the Gospel are required as the historical explanation of the rise of the Christian religion. The creative fact behind the rise of Christianity is the historical Jesus—a Jesus as Divine as God, and as human as man.

---

[1] *Das älteste Evangelium*, p. 41.

[2] It has been pointed out by Mr. R. G. Collingwood that scientific history, in the modern sense, is an invention of the eighteenth century. The ancient historians, when they were more than mere annalists, wrote history not in the modern scientific spirit, but in the spirit rather of tragedy or epic. Thus Thucydides' great history of the decline and fall of the Athenian empire is really 'a Sophoclean drama in shaggy prose' (Collingwood, *Speculum Mentis*, p. 215; cf. also pp. 53, 203).

[3] Cf. H. G. Wood in *The Parting of the Roads*, Essay V, p. 135 (ed. Foakes Jackson): 'The nature of the Synoptic narratives is not an open question. They are not, and they do not pretend to be, lives of Jesus. They are Gospels—good news about Him. . . . They were written by believers to create and instruct faith.'

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 136.

It is further to be remarked, with regard to this question of the historical value of the Gospel, that the Evangelist (if we are right in identifying him with S. Mark),[1] is known to have had access, as has already been remarked, to first-hand traditions; that his narrative (contrasting sharply in this respect with many of the stories which are contained in the Apocryphal Gospels) is from first to last authentically Christian in tone and spirit; that the episodes, for all the confessedly Roman origin of the book and the fact that it seems to have been meant for the use of the Christians of Rome, reflect, nevertheless, with quite singular fidelity the atmosphere and setting, the social and religious institutions of first-century Palestine; and that the stories are told with such astonishing vividness, with such an incomparable directness, simplicity, and force, that to not a few readers the impression has been suggested that they were not listening to the words of S. Mark, but were hearing the story of an actual eyewitness—S. Peter himself. It is possible to exaggerate the extent of the direct dependence of Mk upon Peter, and I believe that this has been done. I believe that the gift of dramatic visualization, which enables S. Mark to call up with such vividness the setting and circumstance of a story, and to set a picture before us, is the Evangelist's own. It remains, nevertheless, true that the Gospel itself conveys the impression, at innumerable points, of just such contact at first hand with historic tradition as is claimed for S. Mark in the earliest statements about the authorship and origin of the Gospel which have come down to us.[2] One point in particular is especially striking. The Church, when this Gospel was written, was the Church after Pentecost, the Church of the Pauline Epistles, the Church whose devotion was directed towards the 'Lord' who had ascended into the heavens. And the theology implied in the Gospel itself is the reflection, as we shall see, of a high, and even of an advanced, Christology. But in the days when the disciples were moving about

---

[1] See the next chapter, pp. xxx sq.

[2] For a discussion of the supernatural element in the Gospel see Chapter VI. It may be remarked here that it is just those elements in the atmosphere and mentality of the Gospel which are remote from the average mind of the twentieth century that are most profoundly true to the mentality and atmosphere of the earliest Christianity, and to the popular beliefs of first-century Palestine.

Palestine in the company of Jesus in the days of His flesh their ideas about their Master were less developed. They did not *then* normally speak of Him as 'Son of God', or as 'Lord'. They called Him 'Teacher' or 'Rabbi'. Not the least remarkable of the evidences of the contact of our Evangelist with primitive tradition is the fidelity with which his pages reflect this usage.[1]

CHAPTER III

Authorship, Date, and Place of Writing

Assumptions to be justified.

The assumptions as to the authorship, date, and place of writing of the Gospel which were made in the last chapter have now to be justified. But the last chapter will have been written very largely in vain if it has not become clear that the Gospel at least fits intelligibly into the environment thus provisionally assigned to it, and that the circumstances of the Roman Church after A.D. 64 were of just such a kind as to cry out for the production of just such a book. The evidence, both external and internal, which is now to be adduced may be taken as confirming our hypothesis, and indeed as establishing it with reasonable certainty.

(1) *The early dissemination of the Gospel.*

Early dissemination of the Gospel.

The Gospel was used both by S. Luke and by the compiler of S. Matthew as a fundamental source for the story of Jesus. It was known to the Fourth Evangelist,[2] and to the author of the *Gospel of Peter*.[3] It is apparently quoted or echoed by Hermas[4] (a Roman writer) about A.D. 130, but is otherwise virtually ignored in the literature of the sub-apostolic age which has come down to us. It was used by Tatian (also connected with Rome), who made a Harmony of the Four Gospels (the *Diatessaron*) about A.D. 170 for the use of the Syriac-speaking Church; and it was regarded as one of the four canonical Gospels by Irenaeus (A.D. 180), who, like Tatian, had been in Rome. These facts suggest that the Gospel, although it was known and regarded as of high authority in widely separated parts of the Christian world[5] in the *first* century, fell subsequently into relative neglect. It secured, indeed, a place in the Canon of the Four Gospels, but in many Old Latin MSS. and in the Greek MSS. D and W it was copied last, the Gospels in these MSS. being arranged in the order Mt, Jn, Lk, Mk, instead of in the official order Mt, Mk, Lk, Jn (based on a mistaken tradition as to the order in which they were written). No commentary appears ever to have been written upon it in the patristic period before Victor of Antioch (fifth cent.). Apparently it was regarded, in Churches which knew and used Mt or Lk, as having been virtually superseded by the longer and fuller Gospels, in whose pages indeed the greater part of what it contained had been incorporated, with editorial modifications and stylistic improvements which were in keeping with subsequent taste. The rugged, early, unliterary Gospel of Mk appeared to the ancients to be of relatively inferior value. S. Augustine goes so far as to describe S. Mark as a mere *pedisequus et breviator Matthaei*—'a person who followed in the footsteps of Matthew, and abbreviated his Gospel'.

---

[1] Cf. Mk iv 38, ix 38, x 35, xiii 1 for the use of 'Teacher'; and ix 5, xi 21, xiv 45, where the actual Aramaic form 'Rabbi' occurs in the text.

[2] Cf. especially Jn vi 7 with Mk vi 37; Jn xii 3, 5 with Mk xiv 3, 5; Jn xiv 31 with Mk xiv 42; Jn xviii 18 with Mk xiv 54; Jn xviii 39 with Mk xv 9; Jn v 8–9 with Mk ii 11, 12; and see Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 397 sqq., where the Greek of these passages is compared, with comments.

[3] C. H. Turner, *The Gospel of Peter*, in *J. T. S.* xiv, pp. 161 sqq.

[4] Hermas, *Mand.* IV ii 1; cf. Mk vi 52, viii 17.

[5] The Fourth Gospel was written at Ephesus, 'S. Matthew' probably at Antioch. Tradition connects the writing of S. Luke's Gospel with Greece; a tradition which 'may be only a conjecture—if so, it is a happy one' (Streeter). The *Gospel of Peter* was probably written somewhere in Syria or Asia Minor.

The evidence of early dissemination is in favour of Rome as a place of origin.

The inference which is suggested by these facts, taken as a whole, is that (apart from the stubborn fact of the inclusion of the Gospel in the Canon, which itself requires explanation in view of the comparative neglect of S. Mark in the second century) the prestige of the book in antiquity was at its maximum just after it was written. A Gospel which was treated as a fundamental source both by Mt and by Lk was quite evidently in the *first* Christian century a primary authority: a fact which requires as its explanation at least the hypothesis that the Gospel was circulated with the backing of some important Church, and which is most adequately explained by the tradition that the Church in question was that of Rome, and that the authority which was claimed for the Gospel was that of Mark, the companion of S. Peter, who (apart from S. Paul) had been the Roman Apostle.[1] It is worth noticing that the earliest writers, apart from the subsequent Evangelists, Lk, Mt, and Jn, who show signs of acquaintance with Mk are all writers who had connexions with Rome, a fact which accords with the hypothesis that this Gospel in the earliest period was *the* Gospel of the Christian community in that city.

(2) *Early traditions as to the Writing of the Gospel.*

The Papias Fragment.

The earliest known statement with regard to the composition of the Gospel is a fragment from Papias, a second-century writer who is said to have been Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, and who is quoted by Eusebius.[2] The words of the fragment (which has been endlessly discussed) may be translated as follows:

'This also the presbyter used to say: Mark indeed, who became the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately, as far as he remembered them, the things said or done by the Lord, but not however in order. For he had neither heard the Lord nor been His personal follower, but at a later stage, as I said, he had followed Peter, who used to adapt the teachings to the needs (of the moment), but not as though he were drawing up a connected account of the oracles of the Lord: so that Mark committed no error in writing certain matters just as he remembered them. For he had one object only in view, viz. to leave out nothing of the things which he had heard, and to include no false statement among them.'

---

[1] Cf. B. W. Bacon, *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* p. 89.

[2] Euseb., *H. E.* III 39, 15.

The unnamed 'presbyter' whose authority Papias was quoting is possibly, though not certainly, to be identified with the Presbyter John of Asia, whose tomb Eusebius thought to be one of the two 'tombs of John' still shown at Ephesus in the fourth century,[1] and whom many critics believe to have been the author of the Fourth Gospel. The testimony of the 'presbyter' is in any case very early. It is probable, however, that it does not extend beyond the first sentence of the fragment, and that the rest is Papias's commentary upon it. It is clear that Papias knows of criticisms which have been made upon Mk's Gospel on the ground of its 'order'. The fragment witnesses therefore to the relative disrepute of Mk in the second century, though it is not clear whether the Gospel which is being preferred to it on the ground of superior 'order' is that of Mt or the later Gospel of Jn. The defence which Papias offers on behalf of Mk is probably the right one, at least in the sense that it represents a true critical appreciation of the fact that Mk's narrative is built up out of what had originally been disconnected anecdotes which had been used for catechetical purposes 'in accordance with the needs of the moment'. The statement that Mark had been the 'interpreter' of S. Peter is more difficult. The Galilaean Apostles are likely to have been bilingual (cf. notes on iii 13–19 a in Commentary, p. 41), and it is probable that S. Peter at Rome would have needed no *dragoman*, but would himself have been able to speak Greek at least as good as that written by Mk.[2] It is just possible that Papias (or the 'presbyter') may have meant no more than that Mk in writing his Gospel became the interpreter of the mind and point of view of S. Peter (so Zahn). It is in any case probable that the closeness of the connexion of Mk's Gospel with the preaching of S. Peter at Rome has been somewhat exaggerated. A Gospel known to have been written at Rome shortly after the death of S. Peter by one who had been in personal contact with the great Galilaean Apostle would inevitably be regarded in the Christian tradition as being based on the teaching of Peter. The real historical inference to be drawn from the statement ascribed by Papias to the 'presbyter' is that the Gospel of Mk had come to Asia Minor from Rome, of which Church S. Peter was one of the Martyr Apostles. And of this fact the Papias fragment is really strong evidence.

---

[1] The Presbyter John is mentioned by Eusebius in the same chapter of his history in which the above fragment, with other fragments from Papias, is quoted. Eusebius himself distinguishes the Presbyter John from the Apostle, and speaks of two reputed tombs of 'John' at Ephesus.

[2] The lower classes of the population in first-century Rome consisted mainly of Greeks and of hellenized Orientals, and the earliest Roman Church spoke Greek rather than Latin. On the Greek of S. Mark see next chapter.

Good evidence of Roman origin.

The next witness to be cited is that of Irenaeus, who writes on the origin of the Gospels at the beginning of Bk. III of his great work *Against Heresies.* After speaking about Mt (which he wrongly supposes to be the oldest of the Gospels) in a sentence in which occurred the names of S. Peter and S. Paul, Irenaeus continues:

The statement of Irenaeus, *circa* A.D. 180.

'And after their deaths Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself also handed down to us in writing the things which Peter had proclaimed.'[1]

The statement that Mark had been 'the disciple and interpreter of Peter' is of no independent value, but merely shows that Irenaeus had read the passage already quoted from Papias. Inasmuch, however, as Irenaeus had been in Rome, the new fact which he adds, viz.: that the Gospel was written *after the deaths of the Apostles*, may be reasonably ascribed to local Roman tradition, and is the earliest piece of external evidence which we possess for the *date* of the Gospel.[2]

The Gospel written after the Apostles' deaths.

It is perhaps hardly worth while to quote the statements of writers later than Irenaeus. The so-called *Muratorianum*, a Roman fragment on the Canon, supposed to date from the end of the second century, has a broken sentence referring to S. Mark, viz.: *quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit.* The words mean 'at which' (or, if *quibus* be regarded, as some scholars think, as having been originally the second half of *aliquibus*, 'at some of which') 'he was present, and so wrote them down'. The author of the fragment may have depended, like Irenaeus, upon Papias. Or he may represent the independent tradition of Rome. In any case what is probably meant is that S. Mark was present at *some* of S. Peter's discourses, but not at them all. Perhaps this may be the appropriate point at which to refer also to the statement of the Roman writer Hippolytus that S. Mark was described by an epithet meaning 'docked' or 'curt-fingered'.[3] The word seems to have meant originally a man who cut off a thumb to avoid military service, and so 'a shirker'. Some think that there may have been a reference to the episode of Acts xiii 13, xv 38: others suggest rather a reference to the unfinished condition of the text, with the original conclusion either lost or never written. B. H. Streeter, who thinks that the

The Muratorian Fragment.

Hippolytus: S. Mark the 'curt-fingered'.

---

[1] Iren. *Adv. Haeres.* III i 2 (cf. also III x 6).

[2] Cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 488.

[3] Hippolytus, *Philosoph.* vii 30.

epithet may perhaps have originally been applied to Mk by the heretic Marcion as part of his polemic against the Gospel, would read both meanings into it, viz.: 'the author a *shirker*, his Gospel a *torso*'[1]—a not very probable suggestion. The later ecclesiastical tradition, as represented (e.g.) by the Vulgate preface to the Gospel, was to the effect that S. Mark after his conversion to Christianity amputated a thumb in order to disqualify himself for the Jewish priesthood—a conjecture based on the assumption that, like Barnabas, he was of Levitical descent.

Later traditions of less significance.

Thus far all the evidence which has been brought forward converges upon Rome as the place of writing, S. Mark as the author, and 'after the deaths of the Apostles' as the date of the book. In the face of this earliest evidence it is impossible to attach any weight either to the blunder of Chrysostom, who (probably by way of false inference from a statement of Eusebius)[2] supposed that the Gospel was written in Egypt, or to the suggestion of Clement of Alexandria that the Gospel was composed with the approbation of S. Peter while the Apostle was yet alive.[3] The latter statement represents merely the tendency of a developing ecclesiastical tradition to push back the dates of its primary documents, and also to claim for a Gospel, of which it was acknowledged that the author had not been himself an eyewitness of the facts, a more direct Petrine sanction and sponsorship than the older tradition affirmed.

(3) *The attitude to S. Peter in the Gospel.*

Attitude to S. Peter.

A friend of the writer's remarked once in conversation, 'How Mark does hate the Twelve!' The remark betrayed, no doubt, an exaggerated impression; the Twelve are certainly not spared in this Gospel, but it would be a mistake to regard Mk as cherishing any animus against them. For a different explanation of the lack of understanding with which they are credited see Additional Note VI, pp. 260 sqq. It is, nevertheless, a remarkable fact that, as B. W. Bacon has pointed out, S. Peter is hardly once mentioned as an individual in the pages of Mk except in terms of rebuke or of disgrace. Thus at Caesarea Philippi S. Peter's confession of the Messiahship is not at all, as in Mt, a subject of congratulation, and the Apostle is immediately afterwards rebuked in the strongest terms as a tempter (viii 27 sqq., and notes *ad loc.*); in the story of the Transfiguration attention is called to his foolish remark (ix 5-6); he is the spokesman of the Twelve in x 28 (*Lo, we have left all, and have followed*

---

[1] B. H. Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 336 sqq.

[2] What Eusebius really said was that S. Mark had 'proclaimed in Egypt the Gospel which he had written' (Euseb., *H. E.* II 16, 1). It was an early tradition that Mk visited Alexandria and was the founder of the Church in that city.

[3] Clem. Alex. *apud* Euseb., *H. E.* VI 14, 5-7; cf. II 15 2.

thee)—a passage which is followed in x 31 by the warning: *But many that are first shall be last, and the last first*; and in the account of the night of the Betrayal S. Peter is singled out as the disciple who boasted of a loyalty which he was unable to sustain (xiv 29 sqq.), who in the Garden of Gethsemane was found sunk in sleep (xiv 37), and who subsequently three times denied all knowledge of the Lord (xiv 66–72).

These facts have often been adduced in support of the view that there is Petrine authority behind this Gospel—Who but S. Peter himself would have reported so candidly episodes which were so little to his credit? And no doubt it is true that the ultimate source of these particular stories is in all probability S. Peter himself. But their inclusion, without mitigation or comment, in an anonymous Gospel intended for the use of the Church is not thereby explained. There is, in fact, only one reasonable explanation, and it is the one which is involved in the acceptance of the traditional date of the Gospel. *When this Gospel was written, the character of S. Peter had been transfigured by martyrdom.* The humiliation and shame of the past had been washed out in blood. S. Peter had at length learnt to take up his cross after Jesus, and to deny, not his Lord, but himself. He had indeed *left all, and followed* the Saviour—and he had received his reward (Mk x 28 sqq.). Thus the story of the past, so frankly told, lost its sting. Its effect was no longer to discredit S. Peter, but to serve as an encouragement to martyrdom. Those Christians who were conscious in themselves of such weakness as S. Peter had at one time displayed, might nevertheless hope, like S. Peter, in Christ to become strong.[1]

An argument for the traditional date.

(4) *The date: A.D. 65–67.*

The argument just adduced provides the basis of a *terminus a quo* for the date of Mk, viz. the book was written, as Irenaeus' statement suggests (*vide supra*), *after the deaths of the Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul.*[2] The persecution under Nero broke out in A.D. 64. The writing of the Gospel might be, at the earliest, a year later. A *terminus ad quem* is supplied by considerations based on the precise interpretation of the Apocalyptic Chapter (XIII). The expectation of a personal Antichrist (xiii 14; contrast Lk xxi 20, and cf. Commentary *ad loc.*) suggests a date earlier than the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and it is more probable than not that the Jewish War had not yet broken out, since the persecution of the Church (which has happened already) is interpreted as being only the *beginning* of the 'travail-pangs' of the New

Terminus a quo.

Terminus ad quem.

---

[1] Cf. J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium*, p. 64.

[2] The argument of Dom Chapman in *J. T. S.* vi 563 sqq., that Irenaeus meant only that the teaching of the Apostles did not perish with their deaths, but was perpetuated in the Gospels, is a piece of special pleading, strangely accepted by Harnack and by W. C. Allen.

The date—A.D. 65-67.

Age (xiii 8), and *the end is not yet.* This suggests about A.D. 67, at the latest, as a probable *terminus ad quem.*[1] The Gospel can then be confidently dated within unusually narrow limits: it is almost certain that it was written between the years A.D. 65 and 67.[2]

(5) *The Place: Rome.*

The place—Rome.

If the date can thus be settled with virtual certainty, so also can the place. The evidence, both internal and external, both traditional and critical, all points towards Rome: a conclusion which tallies with certain minute indications in the Gospel itself that the book was intended for non-Jewish readers (vii 3-4), who were ignorant both of the coinage of Palestine (xii 42) and of the climate of the Levant (xi 13). Suggestive, too, though not in themselves decisive (see next chapter) are the somewhat numerous Latinisms of vocabulary and style. The suggestions, therefore, either of Jerusalem (so Wellhausen) or of Antioch (so J. V. Bartlet) as a place of composition have little to commend them, any more than has the more complicated theory of W. C. Allen, who thinks that the Gospel was first written in Aramaic at Jerusalem and then translated at Antioch into Greek.

(6) *The Author: S. Mark.*

The Author—S. Mark.

That the author's name was Mark cannot reasonably be doubted. The attempt has, however, been made to distinguish between the Evangelist Mark, the disciple at Rome of S. Peter (1 Pet v 13), and the John Mark of Jerusalem, who according to Acts and the Pauline Epistles was a companion of S. Paul. J. Weiss, who thus distinguishes the two personages, is disposed in his posthumous book (*Das Urchristentum*) to identify the *John, whose surname was Mark* of Acts xii 12 (who may be inferred from Acts iv 36 to have been of Levitical descent), with the 'John' who, according to Polycrates of Ephesus,[3] was a priest and as such wore the sacerdotal *petalon* or frontlet, and so with the author of the Fourth Gospel[4]—a theory which is surely to be accounted one of the eccentricities of scholarship. It is much more likely that the ordinary hypothesis is correct, viz.: that the Evangelist Mark was none other than John Mark of Jerusalem. A Church tradition which was sufficiently in touch with the facts to claim for the oldest of our Gospels (an anonymous work) the authorship not of an Apostle, but of a personage of the second rank—a companion of the Apostles, but a man not otherwise particularly prominent—is in all probability correct:[1] and it is probable that the further identification of the Evangelist with the John Mark of Acts, though the earliest notices of the Gospel do not affirm it explicitly, may be regarded also as a trustworthy datum of tradition.[2] It is indeed not improbable that the interest in Mark displayed by Lk in the Acts (cf. Acts xii 12, 25, xiii 13, xv 37) may be due not exclusively to the fact that he was the cause of the breach between Barnabas and Paul, but to the further fact also that Lk knew him to have been the author of a Gospel of which he had himself made use in the composition of his own.

---

[1] Cf. J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-79; B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 491 sqq.

[2] This excludes the earlier date proposed by Harnack (*The Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels*, E.T., pp. 126 sqq.) and accepted by W. C. Allen in his commentary, viz.: before 60, or even (according to Allen) before 50 A.D. Cf. also Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, p. 78, who thinks of Jerusalem as a place of origin. Both Allen and Wellhausen, however, are influenced in their opinion as to the date by their further theory that the Gospel was originally written in Aramaic (see below, pp. xxxiii sq.); and Harnack's theory is part of an argument with regard to the date of Acts, which has not commended itself to the judgement of the majority of scholars.

[3] *Apud* Euseb., *H.E.* iii 31, 3.

[4] J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, pp. 37, 612.

CHAPTER IV

Language, Style, Vocabulary, Text

The Greek of the N.T.

The New Testament as a whole is written not in Classical Greek but in the so-called *Koine*—the common or ordinary Greek of the period, the literary forms of which may be illustrated (e.g.) by such writers as Polybius, the non-literary idioms and vocabulary of common speech and intercourse being illustrated from the data supplied by the numerous non-literary fragments of Greek writing which have been found (along with some literary texts) among the papyri unearthed in recent years in Egypt and published in successive instalments by Grenfell and Hunt.[3]

The Greek of Mk.

The Greek of Mk in particular is essentially a non-literary Greek, full of roughnesses and semitisms—the kind of Greek which might be *spoken* by the lower classes at Rome, and especially by those of them whose original home had been Palestine or Syria, and to whom Aramaic was the mother tongue. The constructions are often harsh (e.g. the subject will often change in successive sentences without any explicit indication of the change of subject being supplied: cf. ii 14, 15 and notes *ad loc.*); there is frequent *asyndeton* or absence of connexion; the semitic construction known as *parataxis* (i.e. the use of two co-ordinate short sentences side by side, to express a thought which would really be better expressed by a single main

Roughness of style.

---

[1] Cf. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 561–562.

[2] According to J. Weiss (*Das älteste Evangelium*, pp. 399–400), it is first distinctly implied in the so-called Monarchian Prologues to the Gospels, *circa* A.D. 200–230.

[3] *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, edd. Grenfell and Hunt; *Tebtunis Papyri*, edd. Grenfell, Hunt, and Smyly, &c. Cf. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*; G. Milligan, *Selections from the Greek Papyri* (1910), and *The New Testament Documents* (1913); also Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary to the Greek Testament.*

sentence with a subordinate clause) is not uncommon—a good example is xv 25 (*It was the third hour, and they crucified him*); common, too, is the use of the third person plural of a verb, with no subject expressed, to serve as the equivalent of an impersonal statement or of a passive (e.g. in iii 21 'they were saying' = 'people were saying' = the French *on disait*; cf. ii 18, iii 2, &c.). The writing all through is vulgar, colloquial, unpolished, and is characterized by a singular monotony of style. There are hardly any connecting particles: the sentences and paragraphs follow one another in rapid succession, linked in the majority of cases only by a simple *and*, or by the curiously frequent *and immediately*. Stereotyped phrases and ideas recur constantly (cf. e.g. i 25, i 34, iii 12, v 43, vii 36, viii 30, ix 9; i 26, ix 20, ix 26; i 23, i 26, iii 11, v 5, 7, ix 26; i 25, iii 12, iv 39, ix 25; ii 11, v 41; v 34, x 52; i 31, v 41, ix 27; i 42, ii 12, v 29, v 42, x 52; iv 39, vi 51; ix 6, xiv 40; iii 5, iii 34, v 32, x 23; ix 36, x 16, &c.). There is a tendency to redundancy of expression (e.g. i 32 *at even, when the sun did set*; ii 25 *he had need, and was an hungred*; xii 44 *all that she had, even all her living*; xiv 30 *to-day, even this night*; xvi 2 *very early . . . when the sun was risen*). There is a frequent piling up of redundant negatives (i 44, iii 27, ix 8, xi 14, xii 14, 34, xiv 25, 61, xv 5), a frequent use of parenthesis (i 2–3, ii 10, 11, 15, 22, vii 2, 19, xiii 14, xvi 7), a tendency to accumulate participles, and to use by preference Greek verbs compounded with a preposition.[1]

Monotony.

Redundant expressions.

It is noticeable that the majority of these Marcan roughnesses and solecisms of style are removed (by editorial modifications of the wording) in those parts of the later Gospels of Mt and Lk which are derived from Mk, and also that in the 'Alexandrian' type of text, represented by the MSS. ℵ and B (see below), a certain number of minor stylistic improvements and modifications have been introduced into passages of Mk in which it is probable that the 'Western' authorities for the text have preserved more faithfully the rougher and more illiterate original.

The vocabulary of the Gospel is exceedingly limited in its range—a further evidence of the Evangelist's imperfect mastery of the Greek language—but includes a considerable proportion of peculiar or unusual words, or of words which are employed in an unusual or peculiar sense, the majority of which are in all probability to be regarded as colloquial vulgarisms of the period. Thus, for example, in ii 4, 9, 11, a word known to have been in vulgar use is employed to denote the pallet or *bed* on which the paralytic lay: it is probable that the use of a word meaning *scourge* to denote 'disease' in iii 10, v 29, 34 is a similar vulgarism: and so is certainly the use in xv 43 of a word which properly means 'of good social position' in

Limited range of vocabulary.

Vulgarisms.

---

[1] An elaborate series of studies in *Marcan Usage*, of which the first instalment appeared in July 1924, is being published by Prof. C. H. Turner in the *Journal of Theological Studies*.

the sense of 'rich' (cf. Mt xxvii 57). A further peculiarity is the occurrence of a number of Latinisms both of vocabulary and style. Words transliterated from the Latin occur in v 9, 15 (*legio*), vi 27 (*speculator*), vi 37 (*denarius*: cf. xii 15, xiv 5), vii 4 (*sextarius*), xii 14 (*census*), xii 42 (*quadrans*), xv 15 (*flagellare*), xv 16 (*praetorium*), xv 39, 44, 45 (*centurio*). Possible Latinisms of style are to be seen in ii 23 (*iter facere*?), xiv 65 (= *verberibus eum receperunt*?), xv 1 (*consilium facere*?), xv 15 (= *satisfacere*?). The occurrence of this considerable number of actual or possible Latinisms accords well with the assumption of a Roman *provenance* for the book, but is not in itself decisive, since the supposed Latinisms of style are not certain, and the Latinisms of vocabulary are such as might have become naturalized in the Greek spoken in the Roman provinces as a consequence of Roman rule and administration, very much as a certain number of English words have become naturalized in some of the vernacular dialects of modern India, as well as a few Hindustani words (such as *sahib* and *ayah*) in modern English.

Latinisms.

The peculiar character of Mk's Greek, and the strongly marked semitic colouring which it displays, have suggested to several scholars, by way of explanation, the hypothesis of unskilful translation from a document originally written in Aramaic; a theory which appears in the first instance to have been advocated by F. Blass, but which has also been urged strongly by Wellhausen,[1] as well as by W. C. Allen in the introduction to his commentary on the Gospel.[2] It is a favourite thesis of these scholars that the term *Son of man* in Mk ii 10, 28 represents in the Greek a mistranslation of an Aramaic phrase meaning 'man' (see notes *ad locc.*). There are two other passages also in which Wellhausen has proposed an emendation of the text, based on the hypothesis of an Aramaic original which has been wrongly translated, viz. ii 4 and vii 31 (see notes *ad locc.*). It is at least tempting to think that an Aramaic written source may have been used by the Evangelist for the story of the paralytic (ii 1–12), but the hypothesis that the Gospel as a whole is a translation from the Aramaic appears to me to be highly improbable. It is at least difficult, on such an assumption, to see why the work of translation should not have been entrusted to more competent hands. The Greek of S. Mark has been described as 'translation Greek' by Lagrange, and as 'virtual translation' by the late Dr. Moulton. It is, in fact, the Greek written by a Jew who was an imperfect Greek scholar, and who habitually *thought* in Aramaic. But it is not, as Greek, a *translation* from

The Gospel not a translation.

---

[1] More particularly in the original edition of his *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (1905). In the second edition (1911) the author, while continuing to lay stress on the Aramaic character of Mk's Greek, appears to be less explicit with regard to the hypothesis of an Aramaic original for the Gospel as a whole.

[2] The deliberately literal translation of the Gospel printed by Allen in his *Commentary* is of value as enabling English readers to gain an impression of the roughness and baldness of the original, which is concealed by the dignified English of the Revised and Authorized Versions.

the Aramaic; if it were, it would be difficult to see why the translator should have left standing in the text—side by side with the Greek rendering, which he is careful to give also—a number of Aramaic words and of Aramaic phrases (v 41, vii 11, 34, xiv 36, xv 22, xv 34). That the Evangelist, writing in Greek and for Greek-speaking readers, should in one or two cases have given (with an explanation) the actual Aramaic utterances of Jesus (*talitha cumi*, *ephphatha*, *abba*), or again a technical term such as *corban* or a place-name like *Golgotha*, is intelligible enough. That a translator, who was rendering the book as a whole into Greek, should have left these words standing in a transliterated form in the text is much less easy to understand.[1]

Aramaic words and phrases in the Gospel.

A few words may here be added on the subject of the text of the Gospel. It has not, of course, been possible, in writing a commentary based upon the text of the English R.V., to enter in detail into the problems of textual criticism, or (except in a few cases) to refer to the readings of particular MSS. What the Editor has tried to do is to notice the more important variants from the text of the R.V., and to express his judgement (or that of others more expert than himself in the study of MSS.) as to the reading which ought probably to be preferred. In a number of cases in which readings which are noticed have been designated 'Western', what is meant is that they are to be found in the Bezan MS. (D), supported, in many instances, by one or more of the authorities for the text of the Old Latin version of the Gospel (i. e. the text which appears to have been current in Italy and Gaul before the publication of the Vulgate edition by S. Jerome, which became the official text of the Latin-speaking Church). In one or two instances reference has been made to the readings of the Latin MS. *k*, which is of importance in view of its frequent correspondence with the readings of the text quoted by S. Cyprian, and which therefore may be taken as representing the textual tradition of the African Church, of which Carthage was the centre. I have further made reference occasionally to the Old Syriac version (sometimes to *Syr. S.*), and to the 'Caesarean' text, as identified by Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, pp. 79 sqq.) with that of the Koridethi MS. and its allies; also in one or two cases to the Washington MS. (W), which in Mk appears to represent an African type of text. On the general subject of the textual criticism of the Gospels the reader may be referred to K. Lake, *The Text of the New Testament*; F. G. Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the N.T.*; A. C. Clark, *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*; and B. H. Streeter, *op. cit.* It should be added that the Revisers of the N.T. were strongly influenced in the readings which they adopted by the conclusions of Westcott and Hort, who preferred almost always the text of the Alexandrian MSS. ℵ and B, except that as a rule they rejected as interpolations any phrases or whole verses which (though standing in the text of those MSS.) were not contained in the 'Western' authorities for the text.

The Text.

---

[1] This argument of course does not apply to xv 34, where the Aramaic (or Hebrew) words are needed in order to explain the jibe about Elijah.

CHAPTER V

The Criticism of the Gospel

(1) *The Relation of Mk to the other Synoptists.*

The priority of Mk.

A great deal of the work of determining, with such degree of exactness and certainty as is possible, the precise mutual relations of the three 'Synoptic' Gospels—Mk, Mt, and Lk—has been accomplished, and accomplished in such a way that it will not need to be done over again, very largely as the result of the labours of English scholars.[1] It is certain that Mk is prior to the others, and that both Mt and Lk used as one of their sources either the Gospel of Mk as we have it, or a document so closely resembling it as to have been virtually an edition of the same work. Thus, of the 661 verses contained in the authentic text of Mk, the substance of over 600 is reproduced in Mt. It has further been estimated that about 350 verses (i. e. just over one-half of Mk) have been reproduced by Lk. On the other hand there are about 155 verses in Mk to which there is nothing corresponding in Lk, though only 31 verses in Mk altogether which are wholly unrepresented in either Mt *or* Lk.[2]

Use of Mk by Mt and Lk.

The two later writers do not both make use of Mk in quite the same way. As Prof. Burkitt has put it, 'Matthew is *a fresh edition* of Mark, revised, re-arranged, and enriched with new material . . . Luke is a new historical work made by combining Mark with parts of other documents.'[3] In both writers there is occasional (and at times drastic) modification of the Marcan order, as well as frequent alteration of the wording—the latter due to a variety of motives, of which the desires to abridge and compress, to improve grammar and style, or to adapt Marcan material to non-Marcan contexts, appear to be much the most common. It is noticeable, however, that when Mt departs from Mk's order and arrangement, Lk normally preserves it, and *vice versa*; and that the same holds good also *in the majority of cases* with regard to the wording, i. e. that either Mt or Lk preserves the wording of Mk where the other forsakes it, or at least, in the majority of the cases in which *both* modify the wording, they do so in different and not in identical ways.

The simplest hypothesis.

It is obvious that these facts are most simply explained by the hypothesis that both Mt and Lk had before them a copy of Mk as we know it, and that they each independently made use of it as a source in the process of compiling their Gospels.

---

[1] The three fundamental works are Sir J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (second ed., 1909); *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (1911); B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (1924).

[2] These figures are taken from Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 159 sqq., 195 sqq., where further and more detailed statistics are given.

[3] F. C. Burkitt, *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus* (second ed.), p. 97.

Three *prima facie* difficulties.

There are nevertheless certain difficulties, arising from three groups of facts, which have given rise to the hypothesis that Mk may have existed in the first century in more forms than one. The facts in question are:

(1) *The existence of common omissions*, i. e. passages in which Mt and Lk both agree against Mk in the omission of particular phrases or words, or of whole verses, as well as (in two instances) of whole sections—a parable, that of the Fruit-bearing Earth (Mk iv 26–29), and the story of a miracle, the Healing of the Blind Man of Bethsaida (Mk viii 22–26).

(2) The existence, at least in the text of the Gospels as commonly printed and read, of a considerable proportion of *verbal agreements of Mt and Lk against Mk*, in contravention of the normal rule that when two out of the three Evangelists agree against the third, the agreement is either an agreement of Mt and Mk against Lk, or of Mk and Lk against Mt.

(3) *The 'great Lucan Omission'*, i. e. the fact that Lk omits altogether from his Gospel the contents of a considerable section of Mk, viz. Mk vi 45–viii 27.

Theory of a later edition of Mk.

Theory of a 'Proto-Mark' or '*Urmarcus*'.

It has been proposed to account for the second of these groups of phenomena—the agreements of Mt and Lk against Mk—by the theory that Mt and Lk in compiling their Gospels made use of an edition of Mk somewhat later than that which has come down to us—an edition into which a certain number of stylistic improvements had been introduced by a 'corrector'.[1] On the other hand, it has been proposed to account for the first and third groups of phenomena by means of the hypothesis of an edition of Mk *earlier* than that used by Mt, a so-called 'Proto-Mark' or '*Urmarcus*', in which the sections omitted by Lk found no place.[2]

A better solution.

The assumption, however, of an early 'corrected edition' of Mk, used by Mt and Lk, which has since disappeared, does not seem very probable. A better solution of the problem of the minor agreements of Mt and Lk against Mk is that proposed by B. H. Streeter, who points out, in the first place, that the 'agreements' in question are partly irrelevant—they are often mere grammatical corrections of the style, in which Mt and Lk may be assumed to have independently adopted the most obvious correction; they are partly deceptive—as for example in the fairly numerous cases in which a rare or unsuitable word used by Mk is replaced by the more obvious Greek word; and in the majority of the cases that remain, the agreement is really illusory, i. e. it is discovered to vanish when the true text of the Gospels is critically determined in accordance with the most probable view, and with due use of the most recent discoveries of textual criticism, the supposed 'agreements' having been commonly the result merely of the erroneous assimilation of the texts of the Gospels to one another in the process of scribal transmission.[1]

---

[1] So the late Dr. Sanday (*Oxford Studies*, p. 21), who refers to Dr. E. A. Abbott's *Corrections of Mark* (London, 1901).

[2] The theory of an earlier and shorter form of Mk has been advocated, among English writers, by V. H. Stanton (*The Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii, pp. 150 sqq.), and is accepted in a modified form by N. P. Williams (*Oxford Studies*, Essay XIII). For the more elaborate theory of E. Wendling see below.

The problem of 'common omissions'.

The problem raised by the existence of 'common omissions' is less serious. It is antecedently probable that Mt and Lk, each of whom independently omits portions of Mk, should omit *some* portions in common. It is not difficult to suggest a reason why they should both have agreed in omitting the story of the Blind Man of Bethsaida (see Commentary *ad loc.*); and the total amount of the 'common omissions'—some 31 verses—is not large. It is not improbable that in a very few instances redactional glosses or expansions have been introduced into the text of the Gospel at a stage later than that at which Mt and Lk used it (see below p. xlv), but not on any such scale as to amount to a 'second edition' of the Gospel, or to justify such expressions as 'Proto-Mark' and 'Deutero-Mark'.

'*Urmarcus*' theory to be rejected.

The theory of a 'Proto-Mark', or '*Urmarcus*', in the sense of an earlier and shorter edition of the Gospel, which was *minus* Mk vi 45–viii 27, would undoubtedly serve, if it were true, to explain the omission of those sections by Lk; and the theory has been thought to possess a certain plausibility in view of the fact that some of the narratives included in the sections in question look like 'doublets' of narratives occurring elsewhere in the Gospel.[2] But it is not unlikely that Lk, on the assumption that he desired to economize space, may have deliberately omitted them, having recognized them as virtual 'doublets', i.e. that the 'doublet' stories were not inserted in a later edition of Mk, but were incorporated by the Evangelist himself, either for reasons of symbolism (two feedings of the multitude, because the Gospel was for Gentiles as well as for Jews), or because he did not recognize (as Lk perhaps did) that the tradition had been duplicated at this point. Sir John Hawkins has argued that the great Lucan omission may be adequately explained either by the theory that the sections in question were omitted by Lk deliberately, on grounds partly of lack of space and partly of the character of their contents, or by the theory that they were omitted accidentally, S. Luke having 'perhaps been misled into doing so by passing on in his MS. from the mention of feeding multitudes in Mk vi 42–44 to that in Mk viii 19–21, or from the name Bethsaida in vi 45 to the same name in viii 22 (the place being nowhere else mentioned in Mk).'[3] Canon Streeter is attracted by the hypothesis that Lk used a mutilated copy of Mk, from which a piece had been torn out of the middle.[1] As against the '*Urmarcus*' hypothesis the objection had been urged by Sir John Hawkins that the sections omitted by Lk are characteristically Marcan in style. Streeter adds the consideration that the question of the lost ending of the Gospel has a bearing on the problem. 'It is incredible that the editor of a second edition, whether it was Mk himself or some other, who was prepared to take upon himself to add as much as a couple of chapters in the middle, should have left the Gospel without an end—supposing the first edition had already lost it. But if the first edition had *not* already lost its end, how explain Lk's desertion of Mk's narrative at Mk xvi 8, viz. at the *exact point* at which later on an accidental injury was to cause a mutilation?'[2] These two 'formidable objections' appear decisive as against any form of the '*Urmarcus*' hypothesis.

---

[1] B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 295 sqq. I should add that the results of a detailed examination of the 'agreements' in question begun by the members of Prof. C. H. Turner's Seminar in Oxford, in complete independence of Streeter, have so far tended to confirm his conclusions.

[2] Cf. Commentary, notes on viii 1–9, p. 103.

[3] *Oxford Studies*, p. 66.

(2) *The Question of Mk's Knowledge of* 'Q'.

The document 'Q'.

The symbol 'Q' (from the German *Quelle*, i.e. 'source') is commonly used by scholars to denote a written document, other than Mk, and containing almost exclusively sayings of Jesus, which appears to have been used, in addition to Mk, by the compilers of Mt and Lk. The assumption that such a source was employed is required to explain the large amount of material consisting of sayings of Jesus which is common to Mt and Lk and in respect of which their agreement is frequently so close as to exclude the hypothesis of two independent traditions of the (originally Aramaic) utterances of our Lord, and to necessitate the assumption of a common Greek source. The current 'Two Document Hypothesis' with regard to the composition of the Synoptic Gospels is to the effect that the two common documents—Mk and 'Q'—constituted the fundamental basis on which Mt and Lk were built up, though it is recognized of course that the compilers of Mt and Lk each had access in addition to a cycle of traditions peculiar to himself, and that the 'Special Source' of Lk in particular was a document of considerable importance and extent.

The 'Two Document' Theory.

Relative dates of Mk and 'Q'.

With regard to the question of the relative dates of the two fundamental documents—'Q' and S. Mark—the opinions of scholars have differed. Wellhausen and E. Meyer are of opinion that 'Q' was later than Mk—a conclusion based partly on the assumption that the saying in Mt xxiii 35, Lk xi 50–51, refers not to the episode of 2 Chron xxiv 20, 21, but to the story in Josephus of the murder 'in the midst of the Temple' of a certain 'Zachariah the son of Baruch' at the time of the outbreak of the Jewish War (A.D. 67–68).[3] For the form of 'Q' common to Mt and Lk it is not impossible that this conclusion may hold good: at the very least it would seem that the wording in Mt of the saying in question, if it originally had reference to the 'Zechariah son of Jehoiada' of 2 Chron xxiv 20, has been modified by the substitution of the name 'Zechariah son of Barachiah' so as to make it applicable to the case of the 'Zachariah the son of Baruch' to whom Josephus refers. The majority of scholars, however, have thought of 'Q' as a much earlier document. It has been pointed out that collections of the sayings of Jesus are likely to have been made for the instruction of converts *before* any attempt had been made—as by Mk—to set down in writing the contents of the fundamental *narrative* preaching: very likely as soon as the Gospel began to be carried to Greek-speaking lands. It is probable that the evolution suggested by Streeter, viz. first oral preaching, supplemented by 'Q', then S. Mark's Gospel, *presupposing* the existence of 'Q' and intended to *supplement* it, then Mt and Lk, which incorporate the contents both of 'Q' and of Mk, and were intended to *supersede* the earlier documents, is in general correct.[1]

---

[1] *The Four Gospels*, pp. 175 sqq.

[2] *Ibid.* On the question of the lost ending of the Gospel see Additional Notes, pp. 267 sqq., where I have argued that the Gospel was never completed.

[3] Wellhausen, *Einleitung* (second ed.), pp. 118 sqq.; Meyer, *Ursprung u. Anfänge*

Contacts between Mk and 'Q'.

It is noticeable that in Mk, which is mainly a narrative Gospel, relatively little is incorporated of the *teaching* of Jesus, and that, apart from the parables in Chap. IV and the Eschatological Discourse in Chap. XIII, what we learn of our Lord's teaching is for the most part conveyed in the form of short anecdotes in which a characteristic saying is enshrined. There are, however, exceptions, which include (i) the Beelzebub Controversy (iii 22–30), (ii) the short catena of sayings in Mk iv 21–25, (iii) the discourse on the occasion of the sending out of the Twelve (vi 7–11), (iv) the catena of sayings on discipleship in Mk ix 35–37, 41–50, and (v) the brief anti-Pharisaic discourse of Mk xii 38–40. In all these cases a comparison with the parallels in Mt and Lk suggests that the sayings in question were included in 'Q'—and, in the cases of the Beelzebub Controversy, of the Missionary Discourse, and of the Discourse against the Pharisees, in a much fuller form. It has also been noticed that the accounts given in Mk both of the Preaching of the Baptist and of the Temptation of Jesus are exceedingly brief and allusive, and a comparison of the parallel passages in Mt and Lk again suggests that the document 'Q' had a fuller account. It was argued, therefore, by Streeter, in an essay in *Oxford Studies* on *S. Mark's Knowledge and Use of Q*, that S. Mark's Gospel not only presupposed the existence of 'Q', and was written to supplement it, but that Mk occasionally drew materials from 'Q', not indeed making systematic use of the document 'Q' as a source, but presupposing its contents as already familiar, and from time to time summarizing or quoting a passage from memory.[2]

Theory that Mk knew and used 'Q'.

---

i 234 sqq.; Josephus, *De Bell. Jud.* iv 5, 4. The argument is not conclusive, since Lk xi 51 has the name *Zachariah* without *the son of Barachiah*; it is possible, therefore, that the original reference may have been to the episode of 2 Chron xxiv 20, 21, and that Mt has adapted the saying. Some think, however, that there is a confusion with the *prophet* Zechariah (cf. Zech i 1).

[1] Streeter, *Oxford Studies*, Essay VII.

[2] *Oxford Studies*, Essay V, pp. 166 sqq.

More recently, however, in *The Four Gospels* (1924) the same scholar has proposed a revised theory of the composition of the Gospels, which he describes as a 'Four Document Hypothesis'.[1] He points out that in the sayings common to Mt and Lk, which have given rise to the hypothesis of 'Q', there are cases in which the parallelism extends to the details of the wording, and suggests definitely a common written Greek source, but there are also cases in which the parallelism extends only to the substance of the teaching, and not to the wording, and suggests rather the hypothesis of parallel traditions or sources, which in respect of their contents at certain points overlapped. Streeter proposes therefore to retain the symbol 'Q' as meaning only in the strict sense the common written source containing sayings of Jesus which was used by both Mt and Lk—a document which he believes to represent the Church tradition of Antioch, and to have been written in that city. He points out, further, that it is probable that each of the great Greek-speaking centres of Christianity would from an early date be in possession of its own written tradition of the sayings of Jesus, and further that a parallel tradition, probably in Aramaic, would be preserved in Jerusalem. He thinks that Lk had access, in addition to 'Q', to the tradition of Caesarea, and that Mt had access both to 'Q' and to a Greek version of the tradition of Jerusalem.

A Four Document Hypothesis.

It would, of course, be possible, even on the above theory, to assume that Mk was acquainted with the document 'Q' (in Streeter's sense), since he is brought into connexion with Antioch in the Acts (Acts xii 25). On the assumption, however, that Streeter's view is, in general, correct, it is hardly likely that the document containing sayings of our Lord, *with which Mk appears to presuppose an acquaintance on the part of his readers*, and from which he makes occasional excerpts, would be in all points identical with the *Antiochene* document 'Q'; on the other hand, it is probable that, by the time Mk came to write, the Church of Rome also would be in possession, like other Churches, of its own local version of the teaching of Jesus. I have therefore assumed, in the course of the Commentary, that Mk and his readers were acquainted with a document which I have designated 'Q^R', i.e. the *Roman* Source for the teaching of our Lord, or the version of 'Q' which may be assumed to have been current *in Rome.*

A revised theory—S. Mk presupposes 'Q^R'.

(3) *Attempts to discriminate further Sources and Stages of Redaction.*

Attempts have been made by various scholars to discriminate further a variety either of written or oral sources, or of successive stages of redaction, as lying behind our canonical Mk. Thus Bernhard Weiss, about 1864, suggested the hypothesis of a fundamental 'Apostolic Source' or 'Original Gospel', supposed to contain not only sayings of Jesus but incidents as well, upon which Mk was dependent equally with Mt and Lk, and from which he was alleged to have derived

Theory of B. Weiss.

---

[1] Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 227 sqq.

Theory of J. Weiss.

large portions of his Gospel.[1] The theory of an 'Apostolic Source' in the form in which it was put forward by B. Weiss is now generally abandoned. A more elaborate attempt to discriminate sources behind Mk is that of his son and successor J. Weiss, who in *Das älteste Evangelium* maintained that Mk's Gospel was 'not a source, but the confluence of a number of sources',[2] among which he would distinguish (1) Petrine traditions, (2) stories of conflicts and discussions between our Lord and His adversaries, (3) a number of isolated *logia* or sayings of Jesus, with or without an historical framework, and (4) further popular traditions, of which the origin cannot be precisely determined.[3]

Estimate of the theory of J. Weiss.

It is obvious that this theory of J. Weiss's is rather an analysis or classification of the contents of the Gospel than a precise determination of sources, and it is admitted by Weiss himself to be impossible to delimit, still less to reconstitute, the several sources with anything approaching precision. His main point is that, whether the sources in question were written or oral, there are more sources than one behind Mk, and in this he is probably right. The Evangelist will have depended, apart from '$\mathrm{Q^R}$' and from 'Petrine' reminiscence, upon General Apostolic Tradition.

Wendling's theory of a threefold Redaction.

A more complicated hypothesis is that which has been proposed by E. Wendling, who, taking as his starting-point the analysis of Mk iv 1-34 (a highly composite chapter), and comparing other passages in which traces of editorial redaction of the materials of the Gospel appeared to be present, was eventually led to the supposition that the Gospel had reached its present form in three stages, an original *Grundschrift* or 'Foundation Document' (M^1), very sober in character, having been enlarged by a Reviser (M^2), who wrote much more dramatically, and who added pictorial touches and stories of miracles, and the result of whose work was then further revised and redacted by the Evangelist (Ev, or M^3), whose main interests were essentially doctrinal.[4] According to Wendling, the most primitive narrative, that of M^1 ('the historian'), contained only a few miracles of healing. It is to M^2 (whom Wendling describes as 'the poet') that we are indebted alike for the 'Nature miracles' and for the stories of our Lord's Baptism and Transfiguration, since M^2 was a lover of the miraculous. The Evangelist, M^3 (called by Wendling 'the theologian'), is interested in the doctrine of the Messianic Mystery, in the 'esoteric' theory of the parables, in the Pauline doctrines of the Atonement (x 45) and of the universality of the Church, and in the theory that our Lord foresaw and predicted His Passion and Resurrection in minutest detail (viii 31, ix 31, x 32 sqq.).

---

[1] The portions of Mk which were ascribed by B. Weiss to the supposed 'Apostolic Source' are set out by A. Resch in vol. ii of his *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien*, p. 13.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

[3] J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, pp. 345 sqq.

[4] E. Wendling, *Urmarcus* (1905); *Die Entstehung des Marcus-Evangeliums* (1908).

The theory of Wendling as a whole has been clearly expounded and adversely criticized by the Rev. N. P. Williams, who, however, himself was disposed to accept an '*Urmarcus*' theory and to suppose that the Gospel had once circulated in an earlier form, in which it lacked the section Mk vi 45–viii 27, and perhaps also in a still earlier form which was without Chap. XIII.[1] Disagreement was expressed with this view by Dr. Sanday, the editor of the volume of *Oxford Studies*, at the time;[2] and in the light of the arguments adduced *supra* (from Streeter) the whole '*Urmarcus*' theory must surely now be regarded as dead and buried; and therewith also the theory of Wendling.

The theory criticized.

Such value as is inherent in the criticism of Wendling is to be found not in the erroneous and artificial theory of the composition of the Gospel to which it gave rise, but in the fact that it was based on the true observation that the motive and spirit of the Gospel is less purely and naïvely historical than has sometimes been supposed. Provided always that the distinction be not pressed too far, it does really seem possible to distinguish in the writing of Mk a dramatic and a religious or theological interest, side by side with an interest in narrative, or in the historical story as such. Where Wendling went astray was in the drawing of these distinctions too sharply, and especially in taking it for granted that the phenomena necessitated the assumption of three different writers and of three distinct strata in the Gospel. Wendling speaks of an historian, a poet, and a theologian. 'Might not the same man' (to quote the late Prof. V. H. Stanton) 'have a little in him of all three, at least to the degree that would be required for the putting together of this record?'[3]

Wendling's real contribution.

The most recent attempt of all at a literary analysis of the Gospel is that of E. Meyer,[4] who thinks that, apart from Petrine reminiscences and oral tradition generally, the Evangelist was dependent upon a number of written sources which it is still possible to discriminate. Thus, not only are the apparent groups of 'doublets' in the central sections of the Gospel (vi 32–vii 37 = viii 1–22?) to be explained, according to Meyer, by the hypothesis of a combination of parallel *documentary* sources, and not only is a specific documentary source to be assumed for Chap. XIII, but throughout a large part of the narrative a source is to be distinguished which speaks of the followers of our Lord as 'the Twelve', and which is interested in the idea of the Apostolate, side by side with a more or less parallel source which (except in iii 13–14) never mentions 'the Twelve', but in which our Lord is regarded as being accompanied simply by a loosely defined group of 'disciples'. The two sources are contaminated in the passage beginning at iii 13; to the source

The theory of E. Meyer.

---

[1] N. P. Williams, *A Recent Theory of the Origin of S. Mark's Gospel* (in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 389 sqq.).

[2] *Op. cit.*, Introd., pp. xxv–xxvi.

[3] *The Gospels as Historical Documents* ii, p. 177.

[4] E. Meyer, *Ursprung u. Anfänge* i 121 sqq.

interested in the idea of 'the Twelve' should be assigned, according to Meyer, iii 15–19. Other passages which should be assigned to the same source are iv 10^b–12; vi 7–13; ix 33–56; x 32^b–45; xiv 1, 2, 10, 11; xiv 17–24.

Criticism of Meyer.

The difficulty of Meyer's view, as of all such theories of partition, is clearly the persistence throughout the Gospel of the very peculiar and characteristic Marcan mannerisms of style. The Evangelist may have been using sources, but, if so, it is extremely unlikely that modern conjecture can succeed in determining what they were. The occurrence of 'doublets', or of virtual 'doublets', in the course of the narrative does not by any means imply of necessity derivation from parallel *documentary* sources, nor again does the variation of usage by which Mk speaks now of 'the disciples' and now of 'the twelve' require the assumption of the two distinct sources which Meyer has called into existence to explain it. On the whole it seems better to eschew the vagaries of a necessarily conjectural 'source-criticism', and to attempt to understand and to interpret the Gospel as it stands.

(4) *The alleged 'Paulinism' of Mk.*

Volkmar's theory.

The theory that Mk is a specifically 'Pauline' Gospel goes back to G. Volkmar (1857), according to whom the entire work was designed by the Evangelist as 'an apology for the Apostle of the Gentiles', an allegorical presentation of Pauline doctrine in the form of a narrative, full of polemic against the Twelve, who had failed signally to understand their Master, and setting forth such characteristically Pauline ideas as those of the rejection of the Jewish people (the Barren Fig-tree of xi 12 sqq.), from whom *the mystery of the kingdom of God* had been designedly concealed (iv 11 sqq.), whose Law was superseded (vii 1–23), whose Temple was doomed (xiii 1 sqq.), and who, because they had rejected their true King (xv 12 sqq.), had finally lost their position of religious privilege (xii 9 sqq., xv 38) in favour of the Gentiles (xiii 10). The Gospel, it was urged, was deliberately written with the object of setting forth clearly the contrast between the specifically Jewish conception of the Messiah as the son of David (xii 35 sqq.) and the Pauline doctrines of the Cross and the Atonement (viii 27–33, x 45)—hence the prominence which was given to the story of the Passion. It was even argued that S. Paul himself had been subtly introduced into the Gospel in the person of the exorcist who did not follow with the Twelve (ix 38–40).

Its genesis.

Volkmar's theory was elaborated in opposition to the views of the Tübingen school of New Testament critics, who had conceived of S. Mark as a 'neutral' Gospel, intermediate in its point of view between the Judaeo-Christian Gospel of Mt and the Gentile-Christian Gospel of Lk. In the extreme form in which Volkmar presented it the theory of the essentially Pauline character of the Marcan presentation of the story of Jesus has been maintained in recent times only by Loisy[1] and B. W. Bacon,[2] of whom Montefiore describes himself as being a follower 'within certain limits'.[3]

More recent discussions of the problem. What does 'Paulinism' *mean*?

The discussion of the question until recently has been complicated by the absence of any general agreement as to what precisely constitutes 'Paulinism'.[4] If Paulinism is to be defined as Volkmar (under the influence of Tübingenism) understood it, then undoubtedly, although Volkmar's largely allegorical method of exegesis is to be rejected, and many of his arguments in detail cannot stand, it is nevertheless obvious that most of the conceptions thus described and defined as 'Pauline' are to be found in Mk, as indeed they are to be found in the other Gospels also.[5] They constitute simply the fundamental content of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it was proclaimed and preached in the first century not by S. Paul only, but by all those who became missionaries of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles. Even the argument about the rejection and 'hardening' of Israel, though it has manifest affinities with the thought of S. Paul in Romans ix–xi, is in general such as may be set down to the account of the ordinary missionary apologetic of the Church; and the thought of the Gospel as comprising very definitely 'the word of the Cross' was not peculiar to S. Paul.[6]

The Gospel not *distinctively* Pauline.

It is, of course, natural to suppose that S. Mark, as a former companion and fellow worker of S. Paul, must have been familiar with the general lines of the latter's doctrinal position, but it is really remarkable how little trace has been left either upon the vocabulary or upon the thought of the Gospel by any ideas or any doctrines which may rightly be described as *distinctively* Pauline. It is obvious, indeed, that Mk writes for a Church which was predominantly Gentile in its origin, and that his book is designed to facilitate missionary work amongst a predominantly Gentile population; and in this very broad sense S. Mark may be regarded, if any one chooses so to regard him, as giving a 'Pauline' presentation of Christianity.

S. Paul and S. Peter.

But if so, it is a 'Paulinism' such as S. Peter also would have endorsed. The Tübingen critics of a century ago omitted to notice that S. Paul claims S. Peter as having been in principle upon his side (Gal ii 6 sqq.). The episode at Antioch, to which reference is made in Gal ii 11 sqq., was a momentary inconsistency on S. Peter's part, with regard to which (it is implied) S. Paul convinced him that he was wrong. The Roman Church looked back upon S. Peter and S. Paul as having taught and worked side by side, as 'the good Apostles' of a previous generation.[1] The Acts probably is not wrong in representing S. Peter as having been the first to baptize a Gentile (Acts x), though no doubt it was necessary for him subsequently to defend his conduct against the strictures of more rigid brethren at Jerusalem (Acts xi 1 sqq.). So also in Acts xv 7 sqq. S. Peter is represented, in a manner which is, in all probability, essentially true to history, as having taken definitely the Pauline side.

---

[1] According to Loisy, the Evangelist 'may have been the disciple; he is in any case a great admirer, or, better still, a great partisan of S. Paul. His Gospel may be described as a Pauline, and a deliberately Pauline, interpretation of the primitive tradition' (*Les Evangiles Synoptiques* i, p. 116).

[2] *The Beginnings of Gospel Story* (1909).

[3] Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* i, p. xxxii.

[4] It is pointed out by M. Werner that it is the absence of any sufficiently clear conception of what constitutes 'Paulinism' which leads (e. g.) Harnack in *Luke the Physician* (E. T., p. 162) to deny that 'S. Paul's theology' is 'really reflected in this Gospel', and yet in *The Sayings of Jesus* (E. T., p. 248) to speak of 'the influence of "Paulinism"' as being 'so strong in S. Mark'!

[5] Even Mt is not really a Judaizing Gospel (cf. Mt iv 24, viii 10 sqq. Mt x 5 sqq. must be read in the light of Mt xxviii 19. Cf. Mt xxi 43).

[6] That 'Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures' was according to S. Paul himself (1 Cor xv 3) a datum of pre-Pauline Christian tradition.

Conclusion: the Gospel is Gentile-Christian, but not distinctively Pauline.

On the whole it may be said that the tendency of recent investigation is to distinguish, with greater clearness than was formerly attempted, between that which in the teaching of S. Paul was original (in the sense of being distinctive of S. Paul as an individual), and that which represented rather the common point of view of non-Palestinian Christianity in general. When this distinction has been drawn, it would appear that S. Mark's Gospel must be regarded as representing (as might indeed have been anticipated on the ground of its Roman origin) the point of view which was in general characteristic of the Gentile-Christian Church of the first century, but not as being, in the narrower and more distinctive sense of the words, a 'Pauline' Gospel.[2]

(5) *Redactional Glosses and Interpolations.*

Redactional glosses to be recognized in a very few instances.

In what was said above on the subject of 'common omissions' of Marcan material on the part of Mt and Lk, the possibility was left open that in a few instances redactional glosses or minor interpolations might have been introduced into the text of the Gospel at a stage later than that at which it was utilized by Mt and Lk. The present Editor regards this hypothesis as probable in a very few instances only, among which may be mentioned i 2 (the quotation from Malachi), ii 19 b (the words *as long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast*—where indeed there is textual authority for the omission), ii 26 (the words *when Abiathar was high priest*—the mistaken comment of a copyist of the Gospel), viii 35 (the words *and the gospel's*), ix 41 (the words *because ye are Christ's*). A possible addition to this list would be vii 3–4 (the note on Jewish ceremonial ablutions), where, however, the parenthetic intrusion of the comment is in the manner of Mk, and its omission by Mt and Lk not unnatural. I have accordingly in the Commentary treated the verses in question as an integral part of the text.

---

[1] Clem. Rom. *ad Corinth.* V 3.

[2] Cf. the concluding remarks of M. Werner, *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium* (1923), p. 209.

CHAPTER VI

The Supernatural Element in the Gospel

S. Mark's supernaturalism.

S. Mark is not shy of the supernatural, as modern people are shy; and it is in fact impossible to reach any adequate historical understanding of the Gospels until it is realized that the minds of the Evangelists were wholly untouched by any such attitude of scepticism or questioning with regard to the miraculous as is apt to beset the minds of modern people who are sophisticated by philosophy or science. The true modern analogy is rather that of the Catholic peasantry of Italy or Spain. The Church in Apostolic days lived, and was conscious of living, in the continual presence of the supernatural, and witnessed 'miracles' every day. Its members had no hesitations of mind with regard to them whatever. S. Mark presents Jesus quite simply and naturally as the supernatural Son of God, whose power to work miracles is taken for granted, by Himself as by others. His mighty acts are a proof of His supernatural character—a sign that He has indeed been anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power. The Evangelist has no more difficulty in believing that our Lord had raised the dead, stilled the storm, and multiplied the loaves, or that a woman had been healed of her infirmity by the touch of His garments, than S. Luke had in believing that the sick had been healed by the shadow of Peter,[1] or that people had been cured by mere contact with kerchiefs and clothes from the body of S. Paul.[2]

The modern attitude.

To rationalize these stories is to destroy them. It is to miss their whole point. The modern mind may have difficulties with regard to them: that is a different question. No doubt there is a difference in the mentality of different periods and levels of culture. It is easy to dismiss the stories of miracle as legendary accretions. It is not, however, certain that it is right to do so. It has often been pointed out that the miracles ascribed to our Saviour in the canonical Gospels are, with hardly an exception, such works as are in keeping with His character. They are spiritually congruous with the presupposed situation, and with the doctrine of the Incarnation as a whole. In this respect they frequently contrast strikingly with the miracle-stories in the Apocryphal Gospels, which more often have the character of non-moral portents. It has been pointed out, further, that from the point of view of philosophical theism the order of Nature is to be construed not in terms of a doctrine of mechanical necessity, but rather after such an analogy as is suggested by the idea of the continuous operation of a perfectly self-consistent moral Will. To a philosophical mind it is not the part of wisdom to determine too narrowly the things that are, and the things that are not, possible in heaven and earth. Belief in miracles has played a great part in the history of religion, and for large numbers of religious people it does so still. Belief in the Incarnation involves certainly the belief that God has acted in history in ways that are unique. The present Editor accordingly does not, for his own part, regard the question of miracle as a *chose jugée*.

---

[1] Acts v 15.

[2] Acts xix 12.

The question still an open one.

Nevertheless, it is clear that, whereas for the Church in Apostolic days the belief that Jesus had worked miracles was a part of the evidence upon the basis of which faith in Him as the supernatural Son of God was confirmed and in part established, belief in the miraculous is to-day at the most a corollary, for a certain proportion of modern minds, of belief in the supernatural Son of God. It is no longer what it originally was, viz. a foundation pillar of Christianity, a ground of initial belief. The miraculous element, therefore, in the Marcan narrative, cannot have for the Church of to-day the same *prima facie* evidential value which it had for S. Mark.

But miracles do not to-day serve as a basis of faith.

The question is primarily philosophical—in part also theological. It cannot be settled either by historical criticism or by natural science. What is historically certain is that contemporary witnesses believed that the Lord Jesus had worked miracles, and that similar miracles, wrought by the power of His Name, were of frequent occurrence in the circle of His disciples. Behind this fact it does not appear possible for purely historical criticism to go. We may say, if we like, that the earliest witnesses interpreted their experience in terms of a supernaturalistic theory of the universe; that is undoubtedly the case. But it is, upon any view, important to observe that neither the occurrence of stories of miracle, nor the frankly supernaturalistic outlook of the Evangelist, ought to be regarded as discrediting the claim of the Gospel to be a virtually contemporary record of traditions which were reported (at least in some cases) by those who had been the actual companions and eyewitnesses of Jesus. 'To maintain', writes Lagrange, 'that the records of miracle could not emanate from contemporaries and witnesses of the facts is equivalent (e.g.) to the denial that the newspaper *La Croix* could have reported miracles as having happened at Lourdes in the presence of its correspondents, and in the week of publication'.[1]

The problem not to be solved by criticism.

The miracles do not on any view discredit the broad claim that the Gospel is based on historical tradition.

Akin to the question of miracles is the question of demonology. 'For the modern man', writes Canon J. O. Hannay, 'the whole apparatus of demons and their works has passed into the region of myth. Even to those who hold fast the ancient Christian faith, the existence of demons is an obscure dogma rarely present to the consciousness. To the primitive Christian demons were

The question of demonology.

---

[1] Lagrange, *L'Evangile selon S. Marc*, Introd., p. l.

intensely real beings, and belief in them was the most pressing and insistent of all beliefs, excepting only the conviction that Christ could conquer them.'[1] It would be possible by calling in aid the writings of the second-century Apologists to multiply evidences of this.[2] The fact is certainly written large in the pages of the Synoptic Gospels, and particularly in S. Mark. The demonology of the Gospel is one of the specific marks of its attachment to the popular mind of the period.

Jewish belief in demons.

The belief in demons appears in Judaism to have been, relatively speaking, a late development. Allusions to demons are rare in the Old Testament,[3] but extremely common in the literature of the post-canonical age.[4] The belief appears in the time of our Lord to have been almost universally held. It provided the popular explanation of the symptoms of a number of forms of disease—not only of epilepsy (Mk ix 14 sqq.) and delusional insanity (Mk v 2 sqq.), but also of deafness and dumbness (Mk ix 25, Mt xii 22, Lk xi 14), and no doubt also of various forms of neurotic hysteria. That our Lord Himself should in this respect have shared in the beliefs of His time ought not to be for the Christian reader of the Gospels a matter either of difficulty or of surprise, since it was plainly involved in the fact of the Incarnation that His human mind should be that of a Palestinian Jew of the first century, and that He should not be in possession of miraculous information as to the physical or psychological causes of disease.

Demoniacal possession as a theory of insanity.

It is readily intelligible that in an atmosphere of popular belief in demoniacal possession, the form assumed by an attack of delusional insanity was likely to be that of a conviction on the part of the patient himself that he was possessed by a demon or demons. It must further be remembered that in the ancient world the nature of insanity was not understood, even to the limited extent to which there is beginning to be some partial scientific insight into its nature and causes to-day. There existed no such institutions as homes or asylums for the mentally deranged; and consequently lunatics or 'demoniacs' were allowed to roam habitually at large, with the result that they became a source both of distress and of danger to their neighbours as well as to themselves.

---

[1] J. O. Hannay, *The Spirit and Origin of Christian Monasticism*, p. 33.

[2] See the interesting excursus on *The Conflict with Demons* in Harnack, *The Expansion of Christianity*, E. T. i, pp. 152 sqq., where a number of the relevant passages are quoted *in extenso*: also H. Weinel, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister* (Tübingen, 1899), chaps. I and II.

[3] Apart from Azazel the demon of the wilderness (Lev xvi 8, 10, 26 R.V.) and Lilith the *night-monster* of Is xxxiv 14 (R.V. mg.), there are hardly any devils in the O.T., though, of course, the later conception of 'Satan' was based on a combination of the Satan of Job i 6 sqq., Zech iii 1–2 with the 'Serpent' of Gen iii.

[4] For references see R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigr. of the O.T.*, vol. ii, Index, *s.vv.* 'demon', 'demonology', 'demons'.

The practice of exorcism.

Such cases are as a rule extremely amenable to 'suggestion', and it has been the common experience of mankind that wherever belief in demons has flourished and has given rise to the corresponding phenomenon of apparent cases of demoniacal possession, there equally the practice of exorcism has flourished also. The Jews certainly practised exorcism (Acts xix 13; cf. Mt xii 27, Lk xi 19). So did our Lord; and so did the earliest Christian Church. Experience, moreover, shows that—once granted a belief on the part of the exorcist in the real existence and malign agency of the possessing demon or demons, or even once granted the recognized necessity on the part of the exorcist to adapt himself to the point of view of the patient, and of the people with whom he is dealing—the use of a solemn formula of exorcism, on the basis of firm and unwavering faith in the power of the Spirit of God to overcome and effectively banish the spirit of evil, will frequently result in a temporary, and sometimes in a permanent, cure. The Church possessed in later times a special 'order' of exorcists, and the office of 'exorcist' is still one of the 'minor orders' preparatory to the priesthood in Latin Catholicism.

Modern experience on the mission field.

The case is not otherwise in missionary countries to-day. The 'modern man' may indeed for his own part have relegated 'the whole apparatus of demons and their works' to 'the region of myth'. But the modern man will not have arrived at any adequate historical understanding of the Gospel until he has realized that the world into which our Lord originally came was a demon-haunted world: that among the population of Palestine or in the Roman ghettos and slums of the first century of our era the belief in demons was as universal, and the practice of exorcism as common, as it is to-day in Central Africa or China[1] or Polynesia. The primitive Christian did not question these things. He had no thought of doubting the existence of the demons. He recognized their ubiquitous activity and malign handiwork alike in the moral corruptions of paganism and in the multiform systems of pagan idolatry, in the familiar phenomenon of demoniacal possession, and in the temptations to which he was himself personally subjected, as well as in the recurrent outbursts of persecution which (at the instigation, as he believed, of the demons) were visited upon the Church. Believing as he did about the demons he shuddered at their power. But there was exultation mingled with his shuddering, because it was his experience, as it is the experience of Christian missionaries and converts in the demon-haunted environments of to-day, that the power of Christ is stronger than that of the demons, and that He is able to cast them out.

The Messianic Conflict in the Gospel.

So the Lord Jesus Christ is set forth in this Gospel as the Conqueror of demons, and the Binder of the strong. S. Mark has a definite theory upon the subject. He believes that the demons, as beings belonging to the supernatural world, were able to recognize the supernatural Christ at a stage in the Gospel story when as yet His true character was undiscerned by men (Mk i 34, iii 11, 12). The demons are represented as acknowledging in the Son of God the supernatural foe who is destined both to break their power and to 'destroy' and 'torment' them (Mk i 24, v 7). Great stress is laid upon exorcism in this Gospel: S. Mark thinks of *preaching and casting out demons* as the supremely characteristic work both of Jesus and of His disciples (Mk i 39, vi 7, 13). The casting out of the demons means that the end of Satan's kingdom is at hand (Mk iii 26). It is not impossible that Windisch may be right in suggesting that in this Marcan conception of our Lord's ministry as specifically directed towards the work of exorcism (cf. also Acts x 38), and as involving a kind of victorious conflict with the demonic powers, we ought to see a Christian spiritualization of the ancient Jewish conception of a 'Messianic War'. The Jewish Messiah was expected to engage in conflict with the enemies of God and of His people. On the level of a primarily political or nationalist conception of the Messiahship this would have involved becoming the leader—like Barcochba in later times—in a Jewish war of resistance against the Romans. Our Lord refused utterly to identify Himself with nationalist ideals or Zealot military dreams. The true enemies of God and of His people were not the Romans, and the Christian Messiah refuses to be in the Jewish sense a Warrior Christ. He wages war only against the impalpable spiritual hosts of evil, putting them to flight *with the breath of his lips* (Is xi 4), even as S. Paul wrote afterwards of the Christian's warfare that *we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world* (Eph vi 12).[1]

---

[1] On the phenomenon of demon-possession as manifested in modern China see the interesting though somewhat credulous and uncritical work of J. L. Nevius, *Demon-Possession and Allied Themes* (Redway, London, 1897).

CHAPTER VII

The Theology of the Gospel

The Gospel implicitly theological.

The theology of the Gospel is implicit rather than explicit, popular and untechnical rather than either systematic or speculative. S. Mark nowhere obtrudes his theology—so much so that a considerable number of modern expositors have been able to read and to expound this Gospel almost as though it contained no theology at all. Nevertheless, so to read the Gospel is to misread it. S. Mark's narrative is the expression of the faith of the Church. It is the proclamation of the story of One who was not merely the Man Jesus, but who was also the supernatural Christ.

The manhood of Jesus.

Great stress has been laid in modern times upon the revelation in this Gospel of the *manhood* of our Lord, and it is certainly true that the Evangelist sets before his readers the picture of a Christ who is genuinely human; no doubt also the strongly human traits in S. Mark's portraiture of the Saviour are a mark of his fidelity to the historical tradition. The Lord Jesus of this Gospel is *angry* (iii 5, and probably also i 41—see notes *ad loc.*). He is *grieved* at the hardness of Pharisaic hearts (iii 5). In the boat He has fallen *asleep*—the disciples awaken Him (iv 38). He *sighs*, looking up to heaven, as He utters the word *Ephphatha* (vii 34), and on another occasion also He *sighs deeply* in His spirit (viii 12). He *marvels* at the unbelief of the people of Nazareth (vi 6). He is *moved with indignation* at those who would forbid the little children to approach Him (x 14). He *has compassion* upon the multitudes (vi 34), and looking upon the young man who had great possessions He *loves* him (x 21). He shrinks from being called *good*—an epithet which should be reserved, He says, for God (x 18). In the Garden of Gethsemane He is *greatly amazed* and *sore troubled* (xiv 33). We hear frequently of His characteristic manner of *looking round about* (iii 5, 34, v 32, x 23, xi 11). S. Mark does not think of Him as being omniscient (xiii 32), and he records frankly that, in view of the attitude of the people of Nazareth, Jesus, apart from some relatively unimportant cures, *could there do no mighty work* (vi 5).

---

[1] H. Windisch, *Der messianische Krieg und das Urchristentum.*

The supernatural Christ.

But if S. Mark thus portrays a Jesus who was genuinely human, he proclaims also a Christ who is unmistakably, for him as for all Christians in Apostolic days, the supernatural *Son of God.* As used by S. Mark, this title means more than the *Son of David* (xii 35 sqq.)—a meaning which it might have borne in a purely Jewish connexion, on the basis of 2 Sam vii 14, Ps ii 7, lxxxix 26, 27. It means plainly *a supernatural Being, supernatural in origin, and therefore supernatural in power.*[1] S. Mark is familiar with the Pauline and Gentile-Christian designation of Jesus as *Lord* (i 3, ii 28, v 19, xi 3, xii 36, and notes *ad. loc.*),[2] but he does not habitually use it. He thinks and speaks rather of our Lord as the Christ and the *Son of God*, who has witness borne to Him by miraculous voices from heaven (i 11, ix 7); who is recognized by the demons, with their uncanny supernatural knowledge, as their destined destroyer (i 24, 34, iii 11, v 7); who is manifested in works of supernatural power (ii 12, iv 41, vii 37); who is clothed with authority from heaven as the Anointed of the Spirit (i 27); and who has power to read the secrets of men's hearts (ii 8, iii 4–5). Or again he thinks of our Lord as the *Son of Man* who is Lord of the Sabbath (ii 28); who has authority to forgive sins on the earth (ii 10); who according to the Scriptures is destined to suffer many things and be set at nought and crucified (ix 12, 31, x 33, 34) and to rise again from the dead (ix 9, 31, x 34); who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many (x 45), but whose future coming to judgement is no less certain (xiii 26–27); who as *the Christ, the Son of the Blessed* sits now at the right hand of power, and shall come with the clouds of heaven (xiv 62). As such He has foreknowledge of the future and reveals it to His disciples in advance (xiii 3 sqq.), and in particular is cognizant beforehand of all the details of His Passion, of the defection of the disciples (xiv 27), and of the disloyalty of Peter (xiv 30). It is possible also that Mk thought of our Lord as displaying supernatural knowledge in connexion with the episodes of xi 1 sqq., xiv 13 sqq. Thus does S. Mark proclaim a Christ whose Person suggests already the supernatural mystery of the Incarnation—a Christ who is the Divine-human Lord of the Christian Society, stronger than demons, able to rebuke the storm (iv 39), to open blind eyes (viii 22 sqq., x 46 sqq.), and to overcome death (v 41 sqq.).

---

[1] Cf. J. Weiss (*Das Urchristentum*, p. 545), who rightly points out that S. Mark does not understand the Divine Sonship of Jesus in an 'adoptionist' sense, and on the other hand has no explicit theology of the Incarnation: he simply takes it for granted, in a quite simple and popular fashion, that Jesus, as *Son of God*, is a supernatural Being.

[2] As a vocative addressed to our Lord the title *Lord* is to be found in this Gospel only in vii 28 (on the lips of a Gentile), unless it is also to be read in the true text of i 40 (cf. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 309). The use of the title did not *originate* in Greek-speaking Christianity—as is evident from the Aramaic formula *Maran atha* (1 Cor xvi 22 R.V. and mg.). It is probable that its original basis, as applied to Jesus, was Ps cx 1 (cf. Mk xii 36, xiv 62).

The doctrine of the Cross.

Characteristic especially of the theology of this Gospel is the emphasis which is laid on the doctrine of the Cross. It is this which distinguishes and differentiates the specifically Christian conception of the Messiahship of Jesus from the Messianic doctrines of Judaism. S. Mark points sharply the contrast in connexion with the story of Caesarea Philippi (viii 27 sqq.), from which point onwards the doctrines of suffering, crucifixion, and martyrdom are the leading ideas of the Gospel. Jesus is, for S. Mark, the Messiah, not *in spite of* His sufferings—as the earliest believers of all may for a time have been disposed to express it—but precisely *because of* His sufferings. The saying about the life given as *a ransom for many* (x 45) is a fundamental key-word of the Gospel. The disciples had not understood. They had thought not as God thought, but as men thought (viii 33). Their hearts had been hardened (viii 17). They had been full of the spirit of personal ambition (ix 33 sqq., x 35–41) and of self-seeking (x 28–31). *Only he can understand the secret of the Cross who has disposed himself towards service, humility, renunciation, suffering, and martyrdom.*[1]

The disciples' failure to understand.

The truth concealed from the Jews

As for the Jews, they, too, had failed signally to comprehend *the mystery of the kingdom of God* (iv 11)—a fact which was explained by resort to the theory that they had not been *intended* to understand it (iv 12). J. Weiss is of opinion that it is from this point of view that the idea of the 'Messianic secret' in Mk is to be understood: Jesus did not desire to be recognized as Messiah by the Jews; that is the reason why He forbids the demons to make Him known (i 25, 34, iii 12), and desires that His miracles should not be disclosed (i 44, v 43)—whereas the demoniac who is healed in the Gentile territory of Decapolis is expressly commanded to testify (v 19, 20). That, too, according to Weiss, is the reason why a 'sign' is refused to 'this generation' (viii 12), and why

---

[1] J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 541.

Jesus is represented as repeatedly seeking to escape from publicity (i 35, 45, iii 7, iv 35, vi 31, vii 24, viii 27, ix 30).[1] But this did not mean that the Jews were not blameworthy. On the contrary, they were morally culpable (iii 5), more especially their leaders, who were guilty of the unpardonable sin (iii 28 sqq.). They are 'hypocrites', whose heart is far from God (vii 6–7). Their Sanhedrin had 'rejected' the Messiah (viii 31), and had 'taken Him with subtilty' (xiv 2, 43), had condemned Him to death (xiv 64), *stirred up the multitude* against Him (xv 11), and *for envy* delivered Him to Pilate (xv 10).

who were nevertheless morally responsible.

The Passion foreshadowed in Scripture.

Nevertheless, all the things which had happened had come about in accordance with the purpose and counsel of God, as foreshadowed in Scripture (viii 31, ix 12, xiv 27, 49).

The 'Kingdom of God' in S. Mark.

The idea of the *Kingdom of God* is not prominent in this Gospel, though the actual phrase occurs about a dozen times. In i 15 our Lord's initial message is summed up as comprised in the announcement that *the kingdom of God is at hand.* In iv 11 the disciples are described as those to whom it is given to know *the mystery of the kingdom of God*, and it is implied that our Lord's parabolic teaching as a whole is intended to throw light on this *mystery* for those to whom it is given to understand it (cf. also iv 26, 30). The saying in ix 1 looks forward to the future coming of the Kingdom of God *with power*: so, too, in xiv 25 our Lord looks forward to the 'new wine' of the Kingdom of God, and in xv 43 Joseph of Arimathaea is described as *looking for the kingdom of God.* From x 14 we learn that the Kingdom of God belongs especially to 'little children', i. e. it must be received in a childlike spirit. The *scribe* of xii 34 is described as being *not far from the kingdom of God.* Entry into it is difficult (x 23–24), especially for the rich, but in order to secure such entry the sacrifice even of hand or foot or eye is not too great (ix 43–47).

It is clear that the phrase bears in S. Mark on the whole a predominantly 'eschatological' sense—i. e. it is bound up with the idea of the imminence of the 'Age to Come', and refers primarily to the final vindication of God's Rule or Sovereignty, which is destined shortly to *come with power* (ix 1, i 15, xv 43). Entry into the Kingdom becomes equivalent therefore to entry into life, i. e. *eternal* life in the eschatological sense (ix 43–47). In Mk iv 11 the phrase *mystery of the kingdom of God* seems virtually to express the idea of the 'mystery' of Christianity, i. e. of the Christian salvation, as a whole.

The title 'Son of Man'.

A few words may be added, finally, with regard to the use of the title *Son of Man.* The phrase in the Greek is a literal translation of an Aramaic periphrasis for 'man': as such it is the equivalent of the corresponding Hebrew phrase, which is used in the Old Testament (1) as an equivalent for 'man' or 'mankind' in Ps viii 4; (2) in an apparently Messianic sense in Ps lxxx 17; (3) in the sense of

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 518. See, however, Additional Notes, pp. 258 sqq.

'man' (as opposed to God) in Num xxiii 19, Job xxv 6, xxxv 8, Is li 12, and a few other passages in the prophets, but very frequently in Ezekiel, in whose writings 'Son of man' is the prophet's familiar self-designation; (4) in the sense of 'a human being' in Dan vii 13, where the human figure coming with the clouds of heaven symbolizes the Kingdom of *the saints of the Most High*, as contrasted with the animal forms which symbolize the kingdoms of this world. During the post-canonical period the symbolic *son of man* of Dan vii 13 was reinterpreted by certain 'apocalyptic' writers, who understood and used the phrase in the sense of a supernatural 'man', pre-existent in heaven from all eternity with God, a Being who was identified with the 'Anointed', the 'Elect' or the 'Righteous One' of Jewish expectation, and who was regarded as destined to come with the clouds, and to exercise judgement as the Agent and Representative of God.[1] It is this latter conception which primarily illustrates the meaning of the phrase *Son of Man* as employed in the Gospels, though it is possible that the phrase carried with it some of the associations of the Old Testament usage also. It would seem that our Lord in His use of the phrase as a designation of Himself was identifying Himself with the future 'Son of Man' who should 'come with the clouds'. At the same time He is already 'the Son of Man' upon earth, and the phrase is especially employed in connexion with predictions of suffering and death (viii 31, ix 12, 31, x 33, xiv 21, 41). It is precisely the paradox of the Christian conception of the Messiahship that the 'Son of Man', who is the Representative of God and the Ultimate Judge, who has authority on earth to forgive sins (ii 10) and is Lord of the Sabbath (ii 28), is at the same time *the servant of all*, who *came not to be ministered unto*, but *to give his life a ransom for many* (x 44–45), and that the road by which the Son of Man must pass to His glory is the road of the Cross.

CHAPTER VIII

The Religious Value of the Gospel

The modern attitude to S. Mark.

By the Church of patristic times, as we have seen, S. Mark's Gospel, though accorded a place in the Canon, was regarded as being in some sense inferior in value to the Gospels according to Mt, Lk, and Jn. The modern mind, interested in origins, has shown a certain disposition to reverse this verdict, and to attach special importance to a book of which criticism enables us to say with assurance that it contains the earliest written record of the story of Jesus which we possess. No doubt there is danger in this attitude of a certain distortion of emphasis. The New Testament contains more than one warning against the tendency to identify Christianity with a merely external knowledge of Christ after the flesh (2 Cor v 16, Jn xvi 7). It is doubtless the case that for the modern mind, which desires above all things a purely objective historical picture of Jesus as He actually lived, this Gospel is in some ways the essential and primary document. But that was not the purpose for which it was originally written, and it is capable of mediating, like other books of the New Testament, to those who approach it in the light of Christianity, a knowledge of Christ after the Spirit.

---

[1] Cf. Eth. Enoch xlvi 1 sqq., xlviii 2 sqq., lxix 26 sqq. (in R. H. Charles, *Apocr. and Pseudepigr. of the O.T.* ii 214 sqq.); also 2 Esdras xiii.

Value of the historical approach to the Gospel.

There is gain, nevertheless, in the modern historical method of approach to the Gospel. Read simply and naturally, with the aid of some measure of historical insight, and in the light of a criticism which interprets but does not destroy it, the book is able, if we will allow it to do so, to transport us, by the power of the historical imagination, away from the surroundings and atmosphere and the complex civilization of to-day, with its bewilderment and scepticism, its spiritual *malaise*, its half profession and half denial of Christianity, to the strangely different, and from the religious point of view the simpler and more sternly real atmosphere of the Rome of the first century, in which the profession of Christianity was a matter, in the most literal sense of the words, of life and death. We are introduced to the spiritual society of the poor saints of a great city—those who, poor, outcast, and persecuted (for it is probable that in first-century Rome, as in first-century Corinth, 'not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble' were among those who were called), were yet bearing witness, in the midst of a 'crooked and perverse generation' and at the cost of suffering and persecution, to their heroic faith in the crucified, victorious, and risen Christ. We are given some insight into the hopes, the faith, and the atmosphere of the Christian Church of those early days. We see them as a community of poor men and women, ignorant, no doubt, and for the most part unsophisticated by culture, but a community, nevertheless, who had 'turned from dumb idols to serve a God living and true', who were daily in contact with heathenism and with the nameless abominations of the great wicked city on the Tiber, and who were daily confronting the imminent perils of martyrdom, torture, and death. Already, when this Gospel was written, the issues were joined between Caesar and Christ. We remind ourselves that to all outward appearance the scales were overwhelmingly weighted in favour of Caesar, but that the victory was with the triumphant faith of which this Gospel is the sublimely confident expression. It is probable that our own generation is more conscious than previous generations have been that the mentality, the atmosphere of thought, of the Gospel is that of the first century and not that of the twentieth. It is nevertheless true that although its mentality and atmosphere is not that of to-day, its message is spiritually valid for our own, as for all generations.

The Gospel a setting forth of the inner meaning of Christianity as a life to be lived.

For the Gospel emphatically sets before men the great doctrine and fact of the Cross. It brings before them the Figure of Jesus, and propounds the great challenging question—*Who say ye that I am?* And it sets forth also the way of discipleship as a spiritual 'following' of One who demands from His disciples an absolute loyalty which knows no reserves, which may involve the forsaking of all things, which shrinks from no sacrifice, and which is ready to count life itself well lost for His sake. The Gospel from this point of view may be interpreted—and perhaps it was meant to be interpreted—as not only a record of the story of Jesus, but as a setting forth of the inner meaning of Christianity as a life to be lived. The historical story of Jesus is adapted to serve as the spiritual ideal of the religious life-story of the Christian disciple.

For the spiritual life of the Christian had its beginning, like the story of Jesus, in an experience of Baptism—a Baptism, such as John had proclaimed, of repentance unto the remission of sins, but one which needed to be completed, like the Baptism of Jesus, by the gift of the Spirit. After Baptism, the experience of temptation—for the disciple as for his Lord. And the new life might well mean, for the former as for the latter, a breach with home, the abandonment of family and friends. Men were still being called, like the earliest disciples by the Lake, to forsake all and to follow Christ. And the call in the case of many was a call still to missionary work—to the fishery of men. Men were being sent out still to proclaim the Good News, to cast out demons, to heal the sick. They had need of supernatural strength: but the Lord was still the giver of spiritual bread to the multitudes, both to Jews and to Gentiles. Did not He Himself say to the disciples in the Upper Room 'This is My Body . . . This is My Blood'? And the confession 'Thou art the Christ' which was made by S. Peter at Caesarea Philippi is the confession which each Christian must make. But the Lord did not accept it, in the sense in which S. Peter then offered it, because S. Peter had not reckoned with the Cross. It is in terms of the mystery of the Passion, and not otherwise, that the true Christian confession of the Messiahship of Jesus must be made. And therefore it follows, as aforesaid, that the way of the Cross must be trodden by the Christian, as it was trodden by the Christ: without suffering no victory, without the Cross no eternal reward, without the grave no resurrection. Nevertheless, beyond the crucifixion, the death, the burial, is the Easter message of the Empty Tomb. The story of the Risen Christ the unfinished narrative of this Gospel does not contain, save in the form of a summary or summaries, supplied by later hands. It does not greatly matter, since in the period when the book was written the simplest of Christians was able to finish the story for himself, inasmuch as the Resurrection of Jesus was the very foundation of his faith. There remained the great lesson of watchfulness and prayer: for S. Peter, who slept in the Garden of Gethsemane, was guilty, when the moment of crisis arrived, of the denial of his Lord. S. Peter's loyalty had since been vindicated gloriously by martyrdom. Nevertheless, for all Christians the stern warning words stood written in the Gospel—'Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation'.

A message for to-day.

It is when we have thus succeeded, it may be, in grasping something of the religious meaning of the Gospel, considered as a spiritual message addressed to the Church for which it was originally written, that we may be able in some measure to understand it also as a spiritual message addressed to the Church of to-day. The Gospel challenges the half-faiths and the half-hearted discipleship of later days with the stern reality of its insistence upon the Cross.

The central story of the Gospel.

And the Gospel brings before us also the figure of Jesus in the concrete reality of His historical life. It enables us to see Him, in the wonderful attractiveness and strength of His Divine-human manhood, pursuing His mission in Galilee, unhurried, though thronged by the multitudes, seeking rest and retirement, and yet always at leisure for those who approached Him and needed His help; compassionate towards sinners and those who were out of the way, and yet stern towards sin; the friend of the outcast, the foe of all respectable hypocrisy and of every form of unreality and sham; the healer of souls as of bodies, proclaiming the Good News of the Coming Kingdom, feeding the multitudes as they sit about Him in the open air on the green grass. We see Him as He 'went about doing good and healing all that were under the tyranny of the devil: for God was with Him'.[1] We see Him again on the last journey to Jerusalem going deliberately to meet His death, well knowing what lies before Him, but striding ahead with resolute steps, while the disciples follow, wondering and afraid. We see Him as He challenges the authorities and as in turn He meets their challenge; we hear Him silence His opponents, until none dare ask Him questions any more. We see Him betrayed, forsaken, agonizing in the Garden, taken prisoner, insulted, tried, condemned. We mark His majestic bearing throughout His Passion. We see Him die, and are told the story of His burial. We know that He is victorious over death.

The consentient testimony of Christendom.

It is in the setting forth of this central story, in the bringing of Jesus Himself thus vividly before the reader, that the supreme religious value of the Gospel will always reside, and to this the consentient voice of Christendom assents. In the Catholic ceremonial of High Mass the Gospel Book is solemnly censed before the reading of the Gospel, as the Elements are after consecration: the Church, I suppose, thereby signifying that through the reading of the Gospel, just as truly as through the Sacrament itself, the Divine Christ is manifested to those who have faith and insight to discern Him. It is a conviction in respect of which Catholicism and Evangelicalism are at one.

---

[1] Acts x 38.

CHAPTER IX

Bibliography

The Bibliography here given is intended for the guidance of those who wish to make a more thorough study of the Gospel. It makes no pretence to be complete, but is merely a list of such books as the Editor has himself found serviceable. An asterisk indicates that a book is specially valuable. The authors' names in the first and third lists are arranged alphabetically.

(1) Commentaries

W. C. Allen, *The Gospel according to S. Mark* (The Oxford Church Biblical Commentary, Rivingtons, London, 1915).

B. W. Bacon, *The Beginnings of Gospel Story* (Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.A., 1909): often suggestive, but very radical.

J. V. Bartlet, *St. Mark* (Century Bible, T. C. and E. C. Jack, Edinburgh, 1922): a revision of the older commentary by S. F. D. Salmond.

E. P. Gould, *St. Mark* (International Critical Commentary, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1896).

H. J. Holtzmann, *Synoptiker* (3rd edn., J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1901).

*E. Klostermann, *Markus* (*Handbuch zum N.T.*, J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1907).

*M.-J. Lagrange, *L'Evangile selon S. Marc* (J. Gabalda & Cie., Paris, 1911): a first-rate piece of Roman Catholic scholarship.

*A. Loisy, *Les Evangiles Synoptiques* (2 vols., chez l'auteur, Ceffonds, près Montier-en-Der, Haute-Marne, 1907): strongly 'modernist'.

*A. Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel* (Macmillan, London, 1901): an interesting exposition from the point of view of 'liberalism'.

*C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, vol. i (Macmillan, London, 1909): from the point of view of Liberal Judaism.

H. L. Strack u. P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (2 vols., Oskar Beck, München, 1922).

H. B. Swete, *The Gospel according to S. Mark* (2nd edn., Macmillan, London, 1908).

B. Weiss, *Das Marcusevangelium* (W. Hertz, Berlin, 1872).

*J. Weiss, *Das Marcus-Evangelium* (in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, vol. i, 3rd edn., revised by W. Bousset, cited as 'J. Weiss': Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1917).

*J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium* (Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1903).

*J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci* (2nd edn., G. Reimer, Berlin, 1909).

G. Wohlenberg, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Leipzig, 1910).

*H. G. Wood, *Mark* (in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, T. C. and E. C. Jack, London and Edinburgh, 1919): the best short commentary in English.

(2) Dictionaries and Works of Reference

A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. J. Hastings (5 vols., T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1904).

A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, ed. J. Hastings (2 vols., T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906).

Encyclopaedia Biblica, edd. T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black (4 vols., A. and C. Black, London, 1909).

A Concordance to the Greek Testament, edd. W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1897).

The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary Sources—begun by J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, and continued by the latter after the former's death (Hodder & Stoughton, London; 5 parts issued between 1914 and 1924).

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, ed. R. H. Charles (2 vols., Oxford, 1913).

E. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (E. T., by S. Taylor and P. Christie, 6 vols., T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1901).

W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (2nd edn., Reuther & Reichard, Berlin, 1906).

A. Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (2 vols., Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1883).

G. A. Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (15th edn., Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1909).

W. Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* (Oxford, 1903).

(3) Other Literature

*I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (Cambridge. First Series, 1917; Second Series, 1924).

B. W. Bacon, *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* (Harvard Theological Studies VII. Harvard University Press, 1919).

W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (2nd edn., Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1921).

R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1921).

F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906).

*F. C. Burkitt, *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus* (2nd edn., Constable & Co., 1922).

F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings* (University of London Press, 1924).

G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (E. T., T. and T. Clark, 1902).

,, ,, *Jesus-Jeschua* (Leipzig, 1922).

M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1919).

*M. Goguel, *Introduction au Nouveau Testament* (Tome I) (E. Leroux, Paris, 1923).

*J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (Oxford, 1899).

E. Meyer, *Ursprung u. Anfänge des Christentums* (3 vols., Berlin, 1921–3).

*W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (Pitman & Sons, London, 1911).

**Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford, 1911).

*W. Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research* (Oxford, 1907).

K. L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (Trowitzsch u. Sohn, Berlin, 1919).

A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (E. T., A. and C. Black, London, 1910).

V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (Cambridge Press: vol. i, 1903, vol. ii, 1909).

*B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (Macmillan, 1924).

*J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* (Göttingen, 1917).

*J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (2nd edn., Berlin, 1911).

E. Wendling, *Ur-Marcus* (Tübingen, 1905).

,, ,, *Die Entstehung des Marcus-Evangeliums* (Tübingen, 1908).

M. Werner, *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium* (A. Töpelmann, Giessen, 1923).

W. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (2nd edn., Göttingen, 1913).

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO
S. MARK

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO S. MARK

The title, as it now stands, means the Good News as S. Mark told the story and wrote it down. The author could not have prefixed such a title himself. At the time when the canon of the New Testament was being settled, the four Gospels were regarded as parallel versions of the same fundamental story. Each book was the writer's version of *the* Gospel: so the early manuscripts have simply 'according to Matthew', 'according to Mark'. The titles, as they stand in our Bibles now, are not ancient, and even the shorter forms prefixed to the oldest existing manuscripts are only direct evidence for the Church tradition with regard to the authors' names which was current when they were written. The existence of such a tradition can be traced back to the second century A. D. But the Gospel, as originally circulated, was anonymous, and probably came before its readers without any title prefixed to it at all.[1]

CHAPTER I

1–8. *John the Baptist*

(Cf. Mt iii 1–12; Lk iii 1–20)

1 The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.[1]
2 Even as it is written in Isaiah the prophet,[2]
Behold, I send my messenger before thy face,
Who shall prepare thy way;
3 The voice of one crying in the wilderness,
Make ye ready the way of the Lord,
Make his paths straight;
4 John came, who baptized in the wilderness and preached
5 the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins. And

[1] Some ancient authorities omit *the Son of God.*
[2] Some ancient authorities read *in the prophets.*

---

[1] See, however, Additional Notes, p. 250.

there went out unto him all the country of Judaea, and all
they of Jerusalem; and they were baptized of him in the
6 river Jordan, confessing their sins. And John was clothed
with camel's hair, and *had* a leathern girdle about his loins,
7 and did eat locusts and wild honey. And he preached, saying, There cometh after me he that is mightier than I, the
latchet of whose shoes[1] I am not worthy[2] to stoop down and
8 unloose. I baptized you with[3] water; but he shall baptize
you with[3] the Holy Ghost.[4]

Verses 2, 3: cf. Mal iii 1; Ex xxiii 20 (LXX); Is xl 3.

[1] Translate *the thong of whose sandals.* [2] Gr. *sufficient.*
[3] Or, *in.* [4] Or, *Holy Spirit*: and so throughout this book.

The Gospel, as we have already seen,[1] was probably written at Rome for the use primarily of Christian evangelists and catechists who were engaged in missionary propaganda amongst the heathen populace. The writer desires to supplement an already existing source of information ('Q^R'), which perhaps contained, among other things, an account of the Baptist's preaching and of the Lord's temptation, but which was mainly a manual of parables and sayings of Jesus. He wishes, in the first place, to make available, in a convenient written form, the gist of that story of Jesus which from the first had served as the starting-point and the historical basis of Christian preaching (Acts i 22, x 36–41); but he wishes also to prove that Jesus is the Son of God[2]—'the Gospel is specifically intended to demonstrate that this title, applied by the Christian community to the risen and exalted Lord, can rightly be given also to Jesus of Nazareth as He lived upon earth' (J. Weiss). For the Evangelist the mighty acts of Jesus are all part of this proof, as are also the utterances of the heavenly Voice at His Baptism[3] and Transfiguration,[4] the acknowledgements of the demons,[5] His own admission at His trial,[6] and the saying of the centurion beneath the Cross.[7] It is therefore, upon the whole, unlikely that the words the *Son of God* ought to be omitted in verse 1, though one important manuscript (א) is without them, and the opening words of the Gospel are sometimes quoted in this shorter form by the Fathers.

---

[1] Introduction, pp. xxi sq.

[2] The words *Son of God* must here be understood, not in accordance with the meaning which they might bear in the usage of Jewish Christians in Palestine (i. e. *Israel's Anointed King*, in the sense of 2 Sam vii 14; Ps ii 7), but in accordance with that which they would suggest to a Gentile Christian at Rome (i.e. a Divine Being, supernatural in origin, and therefore also in power). See further, Introduction, p. li.

[3] i 11. [4] ix 7. [5] iii 11, v 7. [6] xiv 61, 62. [7] xv 39.

It is possible that such patristic quotations are from a catena based on Origen (who had the text in the shorter form) rather than on the Gospel text itself. The Latin version of Irenaeus has the longer form twice.

It is, further, part of the writer's purpose to provide such information as would supply answers to the kind of questions which the curiosity of converts in a heathen city, to whom Christianity was a foreign religion which came to them from the Levant, would naturally lead them to ask. One such would be the question, 'How did the Good News about Jesus Christ begin?' To this implied question the opening verses of the Gospel supply the answer: 'The starting-point of the Good News, as is well known, and as O.T. prophecy had already foreshadowed, was the appearance of John the Baptizer in the desert'.

At this point a difficulty arises: for the quotation in verse 2 is not from Isaiah, as the text asserts, but from Mal iii 1. The difficulty was noticed in very early times, for in some copies of the Gospel the text was altered so as to read *in the prophets.* This, however, is not the true solution, for the reading in the text is certainly right. Now, it is to be noticed that, as a rule, when quotations from the O.T. occur in this Gospel, they are given in a form which accords pretty closely with the reading in the ordinary text of the Greek Bible (Septuagint). The wording, however, of this verse from Malachi departs from that of the LXX: it represents an independent version of the Hebrew. Probably the quotation in this peculiar form came originally from some early Christian collection of 'proof texts' from the O.T., from which arguments were drawn by Christian controversialists who were called upon to dispute with Jews. Our Evangelist, however, does not elsewhere show any signs of dependence upon such a collection of 'proof texts' (contrast the more Judaistic Gospel of Mt): if he actually wrote the verse at all, he must have derived it from the 'Q' tradition, in which it occurred in this peculiar wording almost identically, as is clear from a comparison of Mt xi 10 with Lk vii 27. But it is more probable that he did not write it, though it is found in all the existing manuscripts. The writers of our first and third Gospels, both of whom in their account of the Baptist use Mk as a source, agree in omitting the quotation from Malachi here, though they both give the quotation from Isaiah: which at least suggests that the former was not contained in the copy of Mk which they had before them. The verse from Malachi will have been inserted into the text of Mk by a very early copyist, who was more interested in fulfilments of Scriptural prophecy than the Evangelist himself was, and who derived it from Mt xi 10.

Mk, as we have seen, was not primarily interested in fulfilments of prophecy: but he had heard Is xl 3 quoted by Christian teachers in connexion with John the Baptist, and was struck by its appropriateness. He inserts it, therefore, in a parenthesis at the beginning of his account of John's activity. The Hebrew is thus translated by G. H. Box:

> Hark! there is a cry: 'Make ready in the desert the way of Jahveh;
> Make level in the steppe a highway for our God!'

The Evangelist follows the LXX, in which the Divine Name Jahveh is rendered 'Lord', and in which the rhythm already suggested the transference of the clause 'in the desert' to the opening words, so that instead of 'the way of the Lord' being made ready 'in the wilderness', we get 'the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make ye ready the way of the Lord': but he makes one very important alteration, viz. the substitution of '*his* paths' for 'the paths of our God'. The effect of this change is to identify 'the Lord', whose 'paths' are to be made 'straight', with the 'Coming One' of verse 7, i. e. with *Jesus*: and the importance of this is that it proves that the title 'Lord' was already in the mind of the Evangelist a designation of Christ.[1]

Omitting, then, the interpolated quotation from Mal, and altering the punctuation by the substitution of a comma for the period at the end of verse 1, we arrive at the following as a translation of the opening sentence of the Gospel:

The starting-point of the Good News[2] *about Jesus Christ* (*in accordance with the scriptural words of the Prophet Isaiah, 'The voice of a man crying in the desert, " Make ye ready the way of the Lord, Make straight his paths" '*), *was John, who baptized in the desert, and proclaimed a baptism of repentance with a view to remission of sins.*

It is uncertain whether our Evangelist was acquainted with the Christian story of our Lord's Birth (see notes on vi 1–6): it plainly did not form part of his purpose to narrate anything prior to the work of John. Notoriously the Christian movement had had its *prima facie* starting-point in the *public* activity of Jesus, which in turn had its beginning in connexion with the baptism of Jesus by John. The Evangelist, therefore, finds in the latter's activity the starting-point of the whole.

John is introduced quite abruptly, as a personage well-known in the Christian tradition, and the account given of him and of his proceedings is very brief. Since the Judaism of this period conceived that the age of prophecy was past (Ps lxxiv 9; 1 Macc ix 27), and yet at the same time cherished the hope of its revival in the New Age when God should once more 'visit and redeem' His people (1 Macc iv 46, xiv 41; Joel ii 28: cf. Acts ii 17), it is readily intelligible that the sudden appearance in the Judaean desert of a man aflame with a religious message, one in whom the ancient energy of prophetic inspiration seemed manifestly alive again, created a great stir amongst the people. It is evident that John himself believed that the New Age was about to dawn, and for this reason summoned the people to repentance. From his custom of baptizing men, or urging them to baptize themselves, in Jordan, he was popularly known as 'John the Baptist' (i. e. 'John the Baptizer'—so Mk vi 25, viii 28; in Mk i 4, vi 14, 24 the meaning is rather 'John who baptized').

---

[1] See Introduction, p. li.

[2] With the use of the word 'Gospel' (= Good News) in Mk i 1 should be compared that of the same word in the plural form in an inscription of the year 9 B. C. found at Priene, in which the birthday of 'the god' (i. e. the deified Augustus) is described as having been 'for the world the beginning of things which owing to him are glad tidings' (or perhaps 'the beginning of the glad tidings (which came to men) through him'). The original Gk. text of the inscr. is most conveniently accessible to English readers in Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* (E.T., p. 371), or Harnack, *The Constitution and Law of the Church* (E.T., p. 275).

The baptism in question would be by total immersion. What precisely it implied in the mind of John himself or in the minds of those who heard him and were baptized is a disputed question. The Evangelist describes it as *a baptism of repentance with a view to remission of sins*, a phrase which in apostolic times would be equally applicable to Christian baptism. Then later (in verse 8) he represents John as contrasting his own baptism with water with a coming baptism 'with the Holy Spirit'. If this account of the Baptist be compared with the fuller versions given in Mt and Lk (based mainly upon the 'Q' tradition), it will be seen that Mk has suppressed from John's preaching everything except the anticipation of the coming of One greater than himself, and the contrast of the two baptisms. We have to remember that this Gospel is meant as a manual for missionaries, part of whose work would be the instruction and preparation of Christian candidates for baptism. Baptism in apostolic times meant of course normally the baptism of converts in adult life, just as in foreign missionary work to-day. To the earliest readers of this Gospel phrases like 'baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins' represented a vividly remembered experience, or, if they were catechumens, an experience to which they were earnestly looking forward as to the beginning of a new life. So the Evangelist, with his missionary interest, describes John's baptism in such a way as to suggest that it was identical with Christian baptism in everything except the gift of the Spirit, with a view to which it needed to be completed by the fuller baptism which the Coming One would bestow (cf. Acts xix 1–6).

In the parallel versions of Mt and Lk this baptism of the Coming One is described as being 'with the Holy Spirit *and with fire*' (Mt iii 11; Lk iii 16). It has been thought by some scholars that originally, as a matter of fact, John did not speak of a coming baptism with the Holy Spirit at all, but only of a coming baptism with fire. His message to the people would then be, 'Repent, for if you do not repent now and receive my baptism of water, you will surely be baptized in the near future by a Mightier than myself in the fire of the divine judgement!' On this view we must suppose that in the course of Christian preaching and teaching a more Christian-sounding turn came to be given to the Baptist's words, sometimes by the substitution of 'Holy Spirit' for the original 'fire', sometimes by the combination of the two; which would have the effect of transforming what was originally a threat of coming judgement into a prophecy of the fully Christian type of baptism.[1] A careful comparison of the various references to the Baptist in the different N.T. writings certainly seems to suggest a progressive tendency in the Christian tradition to draw the Baptist, as it were, more fully within the circle of the Christian movement, and to represent him, more and more exclusively, as having been consciously a fore-runner and herald of Jesus Christ. The aorist tense 'I baptized you' in verse 8 may be due to this tendency, the suggestion being that the Baptist's mission is now at an end, since that of Jesus is about to begin: but it is equally possible that in the vulgar Greek of Mk (who probably *thought* not in Greek but in his native Aramaic), the aorist, in accordance with semitic idiom, represents a present, and should be so translated (cf. Mt iii 11).

1. The word *Gospel* did not in apostolic times mean a book but a spoken message:[2] the phrase *Gospel of Jesus Christ*, by the time this Gospel came to be written, meant commonly 'the Good News *about* Jesus Christ' rather than 'the Good News *proclaimed by*' Him. It is to be noted also that *Christ*, originally a title (Jesus the Christ = Jesus the Messiah), has become part of a proper name—'Jesus Christ' (cf. ix 41). This is already virtually the case in the Epistles of S. Paul, and was bound to happen so soon as the Gospel was carried from the Jewish to the Gentile world. The Gentile Christian, to whom Jewish conceptions of Messiahship meant very little, expressed his faith in other terms: the confession no longer ran 'Jesus is the Messiah', but 'Jesus Christ is *Lord*' (Philipp ii 11; 1 Cor xii 3) or 'Jesus is *Son of God*' (Gal ii 20).

5. The concourse of people (there is a touch of oriental extravagance in the suggestion that it included the entire populace) is represented as coming from the whole province of Judaea, as well as from the capital city, Jerusalem.

6. The description of John's ascetic dress and mode of life is meant to recall that of the ancient prophets (cf. 2 Kgs i 8; Zech xiii 4). The leathern girdle or loin-cloth would be worn *under* the rough outer garment, which latter may either have been coarsely woven of camel's hair or possibly made out of a camel's hide with the hair attached. The Law permitted the use for food of locusts and certain

---

[1] It has been suggested that the tradition of the Baptist's saying about baptism with fire has been influenced by the tradition of a saying of Jesus about baptism with the Holy Spirit (Acts i 5, xi 16).

[2] It has recently been attractively suggested that the usage whereby the term *Gospel* came to be adopted as the technical name for a book which set forth in narrative form the story of Jesus Christ, was itself suggested by the accidental

large kinds of grasshopper (Lev xi 22).[1] The term 'wild honey' is sometimes used in ancient authors to denote a glutinous substance exuding from the bark of trees, but it is equally probable that here actual honey is meant. It is prosaic to assume that the Evangelist thought of these viands as constituting the *sole* diet of the Baptist: he means that his food was 'wilderness food', and gives two examples of the kind of nourishment which a desert place might be presumed to afford. A modern Greek scholar suggests an ingenious correction of the text, which if accepted would give 'roots and wild fruit' as the Baptist's fare:[2] but the conjecture is precarious. For John's asceticism cf. Mt xi 7 sqq.; Lk vii 24 sqq. (See further, on the opening verses of the Gospel, Additional Notes, pp. 250 sq.)

9–11. *The Baptism of Jesus*

(Cf. Mt iii 13–17; Lk iii 21, 22)

9 And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from
Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in the
10 Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he
saw the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove
11 descending upon him: and a voice came out of the heavens,
Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased.

Verse 11: cf. Is xlii 1, xliv 2; Ps ii 7; Gen xxii 2 (LXX).

John has announced (according to Mk's interpretation of his message) the coming of a Mightier than himself, and of a truer Baptism than that of water. The prediction is hardly uttered before it is fulfilled: for 'just about then'[3] came Jesus Himself from Galilee, and the *true* Baptism ensued: upon Him, as upon Christians at their baptism, the Holy Spirit fell: and moreover, He was declared to be Son of God by a Voice from Heaven.

The symbolism of the story is in accordance with Jewish rabbinical beliefs. The naïve simplicity of the O.T. narrator, who could represent God (in the person of His 'Angel'[4]) as calling directly to mortals out of the sky, was impossible in a later age. In our Lord's

---

fact of the occurrence of the word in the opening sentence of the oldest of the Church's written 'Gospels' (cf. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 497–498).

[1] The theory that 'locust-beans' or 'carob-pods' are meant (so Cheyne in *Enc. Bibl.* ii 2136, 2499) is less probable.

[2] Alex. Pallis, *A few Notes on the Gospels according to S. Mark and S. Matthew: based chiefly on modern Greek* (Liverpool, 1903), pp. 3–6.

[3] For this meaning of *it came to pass in those days* and similar phrases cf. Lk ii 1, vi 12, viii 22, xx 1; Acts i 15, vi 1, xi 27, &c.

[4] The 'angel of Jahweh' in such passages as Gen. xvi 7 sqq., xxi 17 sqq., is to be regarded as standing for 'a form of appearance of Jahweh Himself' (see Kautzsch in *H. D. B.* v, p. 638).

time men thought of a *number of successive 'heavens'* as extending upwards, one above the other, beyond the visible 'firmament' or sky.[1] Far above the highest of these, 'in light unapproachable' (cf. 1 Tim vi 16), dwelt the Most High: and what was heard upon earth was at most only the *echo* of His voice. But the Rabbis taught that there *were* times when the heavens were opened and the 'echo' of the Divine Voice (*Bath Qol*—lit.: 'Daughter of the Voice') was allowed to be heard;[2] there is a famous instance in Josephus, who alleges that on one occasion such a Voice was heard speaking to the Jewish high-priest Hyrcanus in the Temple, and announcing a victory which had been won by Jewish arms;[3] and the Talmud contains numerous examples. What is of particular interest, however, for Christian readers is the fact that the *Bath Qol* appears sometimes to have been identified with the Holy Spirit, or spoken of as the Holy Spirit's Voice,[4] and the further facts that both *Bath Qol* and Holy Spirit are associated, in different rabbinical contexts, with the symbolism of a Dove.[5]

It would seem, then, that *if a Jewish Christian teacher wished to give vivid expression to the thought that our Lord, at the moment of His Baptism, received from the heavenly Father a spiritual assurance which made Him finally certain of His Messianic 'call', the symbolism of Spirit, Dove, and heavenly Voice would be the natural one for him to use.*[6]

'The words spoken by the *Bath Qol* were always few in number, and were as a rule taken from Scripture':[7] so here the utterance ascribed to the heavenly Voice, viz.: *Thou art my beloved Son* (or, *Thou art my Son, the Beloved*[8]), *in Thee I am well pleased*, is built up out of two or more O.T. passages (Ps ii 7; Is xliv 2: cf. Is xlii 1; Gen xxii 2 (LXX)). For other instances of the *Bath Qol* in the N.T.

---

[1] For the Jewish idea of a plurality of heavens see *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* in Charles, *Apocr. and Pseudepigr. of the O.T.* ii, pp. 432 sqq.; also Thackeray, *The Relation of S. Paul to contemporary Jewish Thought*, pp. 172 sqq.; and cf. 2 Cor xii 2–4.

[2] Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud u. Midrasch* i, pp. 125 sqq.

[3] Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jewish People* XIII x 3.

[4] Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, p. 215.

[5] See I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* i, pp. 47 sqq.

[6] It is probable that we ought to distinguish between the original purport of the story and the meaning which it bore for the Evangelist: for the latter it is an objectively real miraculous 'sign', divinely authenticating the Divine Sonship of Jesus: as originally told, the story may well have been the expression in symbolical form of an experience which came personally to our Lord.

[7] Oesterley and Box, *loc. cit.*

[8] It is possible that 'Beloved' ought here to be treated as a separate form of address (see Armitage Robinson, *S. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, Additional Note, p. 229, on '*The Beloved' as a Messianic title*). In Greek usage, moreover, the word rendered 'beloved' can mean in some contexts—as in Gen xxii 2 (LXX); Demosth. *Midias*, 567; Aristotle, *Rhet.* i 7—'only', especially in the phrase 'an only son'. To many Greek readers, therefore, Mk i 11 would suggest the same thought as Jn i 18.

see Jn xii 28–30; Acts ix 3–7, and especially Mk ix 7 (with which the present passage should be carefully compared—see notes on ix 2–8).

The significance of our Lord's Baptism as an event of His human life is far, of course, from being *exhausted* by the statement that from henceforth He was certain of His vocation to be Messiah. That which then came to Him meant also that He was now equipped with power and with *authority* for such a work: He is from henceforth *the Anointed of the Spirit* (cf. 1 Sam xvi 13; Is lxi 1; Acts x 38). It is only so, for example, that we are able to explain the peculiar note of authority and of finality which marks His teaching (Mk i 22, xiii 31: cf. Mt v 22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44); He speaks with the spiritual authority of God's Anointed. The Evangelist, however, is not concerned to draw out all these implications here: his interest in the story is confined to two points, viz. (1) he probably saw in the Baptism of Jesus the ideal type of Christian 'baptism with the Holy Spirit', and (2) he regarded the phenomenon of the Dove and the Voice as a 'proof' vouchsafed by God of the Saviour's Divine Sonship.[1]

9. Mk explains for the benefit of his Gentile readers that 'Nazaret' (so the name is spelt in this Gospel) was 'in Galilee'—a district in the northern part of Palestine which did not at this time belong to the Roman Province of Judaea, but was ruled semi-independently by the tetrarch Herod Antipas.

10. *And straightway.* This phrase is used forty-one times in Mk, and has the effect of giving 'an air of breathlessness' to his narrative (Menzies), as though the events all followed each other in continuous succession without a break. Actually, however, there are reasons for thinking that this Gospel has been compiled out of what were originally isolated anecdotes of the Saviour's life (see Introd., pp. xiv, xx, xxi); and the recurrent phrase *and straightway* is therefore to be taken merely as a conventional link, a kind of mannerism of Mk's very unliterary style.

He saw the heavens rent asunder (better, *cleaving asunder*). It is not necessarily implied in Mk that any one except our Lord Himself experienced the vision or heard the Voice, though it is probable that Lk, who emphasizes the objectivity of the appearance by the addition of the words *in a bodily form* (Lk iii 22), does not greatly misrepresent Mk's own conception of what happened.

12–13. *The Temptation*

(Cf. Mt iv 1–11; Lk iv 1–13)

12 And straightway the Spirit driveth him forth into the
13 wilderness. And he was in the wilderness forty days

---

[1] For a fuller discussion of the historical significance of our Lord's Baptism see Additional Notes, pp. 251 sqq.

tempted of Satan; and he was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him.

Henceforward Jesus is under the control of the Spirit: the word translated *driveth him forth* is a strong expression, replaced in Mt iv 1; Lk iv 1 by others less forcible.[1] In the thought of the Evangelist it was part of the divine plan that the newly anointed Son of God should immediately be tested by the Adversary. The story, moreover, had a special catechetical value—the newly baptized Christian must be ready, like his Lord, to face immediately the onset of the Tempter. The extreme brevity of the account in Mk is to be explained by the fact that he was able to assume on the part of his readers an acquaintance with the fuller version of our Lord's temptation which probably stood in 'Q^R'. A comparison, however, with Mt and Lk shows that Mk is peculiar in two ways: (1) he has introduced the reference to *the wild beasts*, and (2) he omits to state that our Lord was fasting. It is not necessary to infer with Harnack that he was following a line of tradition wholly distinct from that of 'Q';[2] the Evangelist was an author and not simply a compiler, and must be allowed freedom to tell what was *ex hypothesi* a familiar story in his own way. That our Lord was fasting is probably presupposed by the statement that *the angels ministered unto him*, which explains how such a fast was possible: the Evangelist thinks of our Lord as being sustained, like the Israelites in the wilderness (Neh ix 15; Ps lxxviii 24; Ex xvi 14, 15) or like Elijah (1 Kgs xix 5), by supernatural supplies. For *forty days* as a conventional period cf. Ex xxxiv 28; 1 Kgs xix 8; Acts i 3. Meanwhile our Lord is *with the wild beasts*—here perhaps not simply the natural inhabitants of the desert, but associated in oriental thought with demons and *djinn*,[3] and belonging to the 'power of the enemy' (Lk x 19). On the other hand it is not necessary to follow Prof. A. A. Bevan in thinking of hallucinatory visions of demonic 'beasts', such as might be induced by the strain of prolonged fasting in such surroundings.[4] It is worth noticing that in Ps xci 11–13 'dominion over the wild beasts is coupled with the promise of service by angels' (B. W. Bacon).

---

[1] It is possible, however, that the modifications introduced by Mt and Lk are only stylistic improvements. The use of the verb in question in Mt ix 38, xii 20, 35, xiii 52; Lk x 35 shows that in the Gk. of N.T. times it commonly bore already a weakened sense.

[2] So Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus* (E.T.), pp. 195–196. But Harnack's 'Q' is in any case not 'Q^R', but the document used in common by the compilers of Mt and Lk.

[3] For the association of the desert with 'doleful creatures' cf. Is xxxiv 11 sqq., and for the connexion between wild beasts and demons cf. *Test. XII Patriarchs*, Naphth. 8, Iss. 7, Benj. 5.

[4] See the interesting story from E. G. Browne, *A Year amongst the Persians*, pp. 148 sqq., quoted in the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, col. 4963 sq.

14–15. *Jesus begins to preach*

(Cf. Mt iv 12–17 ; Lk iv 14–15)

14 Now after that John was delivered up, Jesus came into
15 Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time
is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye,
and believe in the gospel.

That our Lord's home was in Galilee has been already implied (i 9), and moreover it was notoriously from Galilee that He had recruited the majority of His disciples. Since Galilee is for Mk the main scene of Jesus' activity,[1] he brings Him there at once to inaugurate His mission. The statement that our Lord's appearance in Galilee was subsequent to John's arrest may be based on historical reminiscence (*sc.* Mk may have asked one of the original Galilaean disciples, 'When did the Lord first appear publicly in Galilee?' and received for answer, 'I think it must have been just after John was put in prison'), *or*, it may equally well have been determined by ideal considerations (*sc.* The Fore-runner's work is accomplished: the activity of the Messiah henceforth begins). The detailed story of John's imprisonment and execution is told subsequently (vi 17–29): here it is presupposed that the essential facts are already familiar to Mk's readers. The short summary of the contents of Jesus' message, which serves as a kind of programme for the work in Galilee as a whole, we may suppose to have been formulated by the Evangelist. 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand' stood already in the 'Q' tradition as the message to be proclaimed by the disciples (Mt x 7: cf. Lk x 9); 'the time is fulfilled' may be an echo of S. Paul (cf. Gal iv 4). Wellhausen has rightly observed that our Lord did not go about repeating constantly the same stereotyped formula: His teaching was essentially occasional, being called out by the circumstances of the moment.[2] Nevertheless, Mk's sentence, which should be translated 'the Reign of God is at hand! Repent and believe the Good News',[3] does admirably sum up the essence of our Lord's primary message. In contrast with the Baptist's more warning note, He sets forth the coming of the Reign of God as before all things a piece of Good News, though of course the need for repentance is still there. The common idea that His preaching at first was identical with that of the Baptist, or even that He regarded Himself as continuing the latter's work, rests on a failure to perceive that Mt iii 2—the one passage which might give colour to this suggestion—is based on Mk's summary in the present passage of the teaching of *Jesus*, and is simply an example of the tendency exhibited by the later evangelists to claim the Baptist as having been already a preacher of the Gospel in the Christian sense.[1]

---

[1] Contrast the Johannine tradition, and for the question of the order and arrangement of Mk's material see Introd., pp. xix sqq.

[2] Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci, ad loc.*

[3] The rendering 'believe *in* the Gospel' is a too literal translation of a Marcan semitism: and 'Gospel' must not be taken in the later technical sense (see Additional Note 1, p. 251).

14. *Was delivered up* probably means simply 'fell into the hands of his enemies'; *gospel of God* means 'good news about God', or possibly 'good news *from* God'.

16–20. *Call of four disciples*

(Cf. Mt iv 18–22; Lk v 1–11)

16 And passing along by the sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and
Andrew the brother of Simon casting a net in the sea: for
17 they were fishers. And Jesus said unto them, Come ye after
18 me, and I will make you to become fishers of men. And
19 straightway they left the nets, and followed him. And
going on a little further, he saw James the *son* of Zebedee,
and John his brother, who also were in the boat mending
20 the nets. And straightway he called them: and they left
their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired servants,
and went after him.

The story of the call of these first disciples will have had living interest for Mk's readers, not only because Simon and Andrew, James and John were now famous names wherever the Gospel was proclaimed, but also because in a missionary church—as in heathen countries now—the acceptance of Christianity involved still in a large number of cases a call to leave friends and home.

Mk tells the story very dramatically—it has been suggested that the O.T. narrative of the call of Elisha (1 Kgs xix 19–21) was in his mind. It is possible, of course, to assume that the Lord's summons to the four fishermen was less abrupt than it appeared—that they had previously known Him, or had heard Him preach. S. Luke, who alters the Marcan order here and makes the call subsequent to our Lord's preaching in Capernaum and acquaintance with Simon Peter, seems to have adopted this view. But in an oriental setting the Marcan account is credible as it stands: men will sometimes in India to-day with equal abruptness leave home and occupation to become disciples of a wandering religious teacher or *guru*.

---

[1] I cannot agree with Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, p. 205) in thinking that the ascription of the words to the Baptist in Mt iii 2 was derived from 'Q'. For the tendency to treat the Baptist as in the Christian sense a preacher of 'the Gospel' cf. Lk iii 18.

The call is in the first instance to discipleship rather than to apostolate—the 'fishery of men' (cf. Jer xvi 16) is in the future; but it is with a view to *becoming* 'fishers of men' that they are called: which implies an abandonment of their present employment as fishers in the ordinary sense of the word. Mk's emphasis is on the sacrifice involved, not only in the case of Simon and Andrew, but also in that of the two sons of Zebedee. To argue as Loisy does that the latter could well be spared, since their father had hired servants, is to miss the pathos of the implied contrast between sons and 'hirelings'.

21–28. *An Exorcism in the Synagogue at Capernaum*

(Cf. Lk iv 31–37)

21 And they go into Capernaum; and straightway on the
sabbath day he entered into the synagogue and taught.
22 And they were astonished at his teaching: for he taught
23 them as having authority, and not as the scribes. And
straightway there was in their synagogue a man with an
24 unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying, What have we to
do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to
destroy us?[1] I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of
25 God. And Jesus rebuked him,[2] saying, Hold thy peace, and
26 come out of him. And the unclean spirit, tearing him[3]
27 and crying with a loud voice, came out of him. And they
were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among
themselves, saying, What is this? a new teaching! with
authority he commandeth[4] even the unclean spirits, and
28 they obey him. And the report of him went out straightway
everywhere into all the region of Galilee round about.

[1] Or, *Thou art come to destroy us!* [2] Translate *it*.
[3] Or, *convulsing him*.
[4] Or, *What is this? A new teaching with authority! He commandeth, &c.*

This episode is intended to illustrate the Messianic *authority* of Jesus (see above, p. 11), as shown both by the character of His teaching and by His mastery over demons.[1] Synagogues for public worship existed in every town and probably in every considerable village. The sabbath-day service consisted of prayer, followed by readings from the Law and the Prophets,[1] and an exposition or sermon. It would seem that it was competent for any adult male Israelite to 'preach', on being invited to do so by the Ruler of the Synagogue, and that it was customary to extend such invitations to distinguished visitors. 'There is no reason to suppose that the freedom of teaching in the Galilaean synagogues was ever denied to Jesus.'[2] The scribal method of teaching was by reference to traditional 'authorities'—it was regarded as the most sacred duty of the pupils of a Rabbi never to teach anything otherwise than as it had been delivered to them by their teacher.[3] The Lord taught independently of tradition, with the unhesitating 'authority' of immediate inspiration, and the listeners were proportionately 'astonished'.

---

[1] On the use of the word 'authority' (*exousia*) in Hellenistic Gk. to express the idea of a combination of supernatural power with supernatural knowledge of divine things, see Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (pp. 14, 101, 125), who refers to passages in the *Corpus Hermeticum*.

With the description of our Lord's synagogue preaching—which is clearly intended to be typical (cf. i 39)—the Evangelist combines a description of a typical case of exorcism. That our Lord practised exorcism in the power of the Spirit (Mt xii 28) is as certain as that the earliest Church saw in His exorcisms a conspicuous proof of His Messiahship. An exorcism occurring in a synagogue, however, is surprising, since ordinarily it may be presumed that those who were regarded as being demoniacally possessed would not be permitted to attend the synagogue service. On the general subject of Demonology in the Gospel, see Introduction, pp. xlvii sqq. The description here, as elsewhere, is coloured by the beliefs of the Evangelist, and illustrates his thesis that the demons, as belonging to the supernatural world, possessed supernatural knowledge, and consequently recognized the divine mission and origin of Jesus at a time when men did not (cf. i 34, iii 11, v 7, and see pp. 258 sqq.). The possessed man, or rather the demon who possesses him, screams out at the sight of Jesus. Speaking in the plural, on behalf of the whole race of demons, he cries, 'Why dost thou meddle with us,[4] Jesus of Nazareth? Thou art come to destroy us!'[5] The demon next proceeds to blurt out the secret of our Lord's Messiahship, though in so doing he appears to make use of a later Christian term.[6] Our Lord crushingly rebukes him, and after a paroxysm the man is cured. There follows a renewed description of the impression made on the bystanders. They are filled with astonishment and discuss what has occurred, but without arriving at any clear conclusion. The blinded Jews (so perhaps the Evangelist intends us to understand the passage) failed to recognize the Son of God. Only the fame of Jesus was spread 'through all the neighbouring parts of Galilee'.

---

[1] The Scriptures were read in Hebrew, but since this language was no longer popularly understood, the reading was accompanied by a translation into the Aramaic vernacular.

[2] I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* i, p. 12.

[3] See Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* II i. 325.

[4] For this meaning of the words cf. Jdg xi 12; 2 Sam xvi 10, xix 22; 1 Kgs xvii 18.

[5] It is implied that the destruction of the demons was part of the purpose of the coming of the Son of God into the world. The thought is similar to that of 1 Jn iii 8. The passage has an important bearing upon the question of Mk's Christology.

[6] There seems to be no evidence that 'the Holy One of God' was in Judaism a Messianic title. It became so in Christianity when Ps xvi 10 was interpreted as a prophecy of our Lord's Resurrection (Acts ii 25 sqq.). On the other hand, it is worth noticing that the Gk. word for 'holy' which is used in Acts ii 27 (after the LXX version of Ps xvi 10) is different from the word translated 'holy' in Mk i 24, though virtually synonymous with it in meaning.

21. *Capernaum*, the centre of much of our Lord's work in Galilee, probably occupied the site of the modern *Tell Hûm*, on the NW. border of the Lake of Galilee, where the remains of a synagogue, with other ruins, are still to be seen. The late Dr. Sanday, in *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* (pp. 36 sqq.), argued, with some hesitation, in favour of the alternative site proposed, viz. that of Khân Minyeh, a few miles further W., where the caravan route from Jerusalem to Damascus, after skirting the border of the Lake, diverges inland.[1]

And straightway. It has been suggested that the call of the disciples took place on a Friday, and that the party entered Capernaum the same day. The Sabbath began, according to Jewish reckoning, at 6 p.m. on Friday evening. It is probable, however, that here, as elsewhere, *straightway* is merely the Marcan particle of transition and need not imply any immediate connexion in time.

25. *Be quiet.* The verb literally means 'be muzzled'. It is used again in iv 39, where the storm is addressed as a demon. E. Rohde (*Psyche*, p. 424) has shown that the word was technically used in the language of hellenistic magic to express the *binding* of a person by means of a powerful spell, so as to render him impotent to do harm.

29–31. *Simon's wife's mother*

(Cf. Mt viii 14–15; Lk iv 38–39)

29 And straightway, when they were come out of the synagogue, they came[1] into the house of Simon and Andrew,
30 with James and John. Now Simon's wife's mother lay
31 sick of a fever; and straightway they tell him of her: and he came and took her by the hand, and raised her up; and the fever left her, and she ministered unto them.

[1] Some ancient authorities read *when he was come out of the synagogue, he came, &c.*

Simon and Andrew apparently occupied a house jointly at Capernaum: it served as our Lord's head-quarters while He was in the city, and hospitality was also extended to James and John.

---

[1] Dr. Sanday subsequently revoked this judgement in an article on *The Site of Capernaum* contributed to the *J. T. S.* (Oct. 1903). The identification with Khân Minyeh is maintained by Sir G. A. Smith in *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (p. 456).

Mk assumes that they naturally went home from the synagogue to this house, and since he has not mentioned the house before, the impression is given that they now for the first time entered it. On the assumption that the Lord had not hitherto won fame as a healer of the sick, it has been suggested that they tell Him about the invalid, not with the idea that He would heal her, but to excuse her non-appearance. Our Lord visits the sick-room and raises up the patient, with the result that she is now able to attend to the needs of the guests. From the fact that this duty devolved upon the mother-in-law it has been inferred that Simon was a widower: but see 1 Cor ix 5.

32–34. *A concourse of patients at sundown*

(Cf. Mt viii 16–17; Lk iv 40–41)

32 And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him
all that were sick, and them that were possessed with
33 devils.[1] And all the city was gathered together at the door.
34 And he healed many that were sick with divers diseases,
and cast out many devils;[2] and he suffered not the devils[2]
to speak, because they knew him.[3]

---

[1] Or, *demoniacs*. [2] Gr. *demons*.
[3] Many ancient authorities add *to be Christ*. See Lk iv 41.

A generalized account of a typical scene, such as no doubt recurred frequently in the course of our Lord's work in Galilee. The division of the patients into the two classes of sick people and demoniacs is characteristic of Mk, who gives special prominence to the work of exorcism (cf. i 39, iii 11: also iii 15, vi 7 of the mission of the disciples), and the last words of the section are an echo of his special theory about the demons' recognition of our Lord. The majority of commentators connect these verses closely with the preceding sections, and point out that the Sabbath ended at sundown. According to the Mishnah it was forbidden to carry a corpse through the streets on the Sabbath, but permissible to carry a living person on a stretcher. It is assumed, therefore, that the friends of the patients waited until sundown, because they supposed that our Lord would naturally be reluctant to heal upon the Sabbath. This may be so: on the other hand, the evening would be the time when they might naturally hope to find Him at home, whether on the Sabbath or on a working day.

35–39. *Jesus leaves Capernaum*

(Cf. Lk iv 42–44)

35 And in the morning, a great while before day, he rose up
and went out, and departed into a desert place, and there

36 prayed. And Simon and they that were with him followed
37 after him; and they found him, and say unto him, All are
38 seeking thee. And he saith unto them, Let us go elsewhere
into the next towns, that I may preach there also; for to
39 this end came I forth. And he went into their synagogues
throughout all Galilee, preaching and casting out devils.[1]

[1] Gr. *demons.*

Desert place means simply 'a lonely spot'; *followed after him* might be better translated 'pursued Him'. Apparently the Lord had left Capernaum without informing them of His intention: He went out early to pray, and when they awoke they found Him gone. This may well be authentic reminiscence of what happened on a particular occasion. The disciples are proud of their Master's popularity—'Every one is looking for thee!' But the Lord does not wish His activity to be monopolized by one town. It is possible that *for to this end came I forth* means 'that was my purpose in leaving Capernaum' (cf. v 35), though Lk, who renders *for therefore was I sent,* understands the words as referring to our Lord's mission generally—perhaps, indeed, with reference to the whole purpose of His coming into the world.

It is assumed by many commentators that the entire sequence of events from the call of the disciples to the departure from Capernaum is continuous, that the episodes all happened within the space of about thirty-six hours, and that they represent S. Peter's vividly remembered account of the first Sabbath which he spent in his Master's company. Undoubtedly the narrative as it stands gives the impression of a single day's events, but if this is intended by the Evangelist, I think it is better understood as an account of a typical day than as a record of the initial day of our Lord's activity in Capernaum. The preaching in the synagogue, the exorcism of the demoniac, the healing of the sick, the throng of patients in the evening, perhaps also the habit of going out early before dawn to pray in solitude, all seem to me to be essentially *typical* scenes from our Lord's ministry.

The abrupt departure from Capernaum is further supposed by Loisy and others to have been due to dismay on the part of Jesus at the turn which events were taking: His mission was the preaching of repentance, He finds Himself regarded as a wonder-worker and beset by requests for bodily healing, so that His proper work is hindered: at all costs He must escape from the city and take counsel alone with God in prayer. Similarly for J. Weiss our Lord's departure is a 'flight' dictated solely by the desire to be alone: the further motive suggested by the narrative, viz. the consciousness of a mission to other places besides Capernaum, he regards as having been intruded by the Evangelist, who failed to understand the real reason for Jesus' 'flight'. B. W. Bacon among others agrees with this: but it appears to me that the whole theory involves reading too much between the lines.

40–45. *The Leper*

(Cf. Mt viii 1–4; Lk v 12–16)

40 And there cometh to him a leper, beseeching him, and kneeling down to him,[1] and saying unto him, If thou wilt,
41 thou canst make me clean. And being moved with compassion,[2] he stretched forth his hand, and touched him, and
42 saith unto him, I will; be thou made clean. And straightway the leprosy departed from him, and he was made clean.
43 And he strictly[3] charged him, and straightway sent him
44 out,[4] and saith unto him, See thou say nothing to any man: but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing the things which Moses commanded, for a testi-
45 mony unto them. But he went out, and began to publish it much, and to spread abroad the matter,[5] insomuch that Jesus[6] could no more openly enter into a[7] city, but was without in desert places: and they came to him from every quarter.

[1] Some ancient authorities omit *and kneeling down to him.*
[2] Some ancient authorities read *being angry.* [3] Or, *sternly.*
[4] Translate, *thrust him out.* [5] Gk. *word.* [6] Gk. *he.*
[7] Or, *the city.*

Leprosy proper is an incurable disease, but the Hebrew word so translated in the O.T. covered various diseases of the skin, some of which were curable.[1] Persons suffering from 'leprosy' in any of its forms were required by the law to abstain from human intercourse, and were forbidden to enter a dwelling: if approached they were to give warning of their condition by crying 'Unclean, unclean!' (Lev xiii 45–46). If at any time they had reason to suppose themselves cured, they must submit themselves for inspection to a priest, and if certified clean, must go through a ritual of purification and offer prescribed sacrifices (Lev xiv).

The leper in this story transgresses the Law in coming to Jesus, but makes a strong appeal to Him. The statement that he came kneeling down to Him is probably an original part of the text: it does not, of course, here express worship, but strong entreaty. The man's words express doubt not of our Lord's power, but of His willingness, to heal. Our Lord heals the leper, even stretching out His hand and touching him,[1] but enjoins strictly that he must comply with the requirements of the Law.

---

[1] For a good note on the various forms of leprosy see Lagrange, *ad loc.*

Some of the many points of difficulty in the story are indicated by the variant readings and alternative translations noted in the text. Mk certainly represents our Lord as being deeply moved, and apparently as being displeased. The verb translated *strictly* (or, *sternly*) *charged him* is one which in the LXX has the meaning 'to be angry'. Elsewhere in the N.T. it is used in Mt ix 30 ('vehemently charged them'?), Mk xiv 5 (where the rendering 'were angry with her' suits the context) and in Jn xi 33–38 (where the meaning appears to be 'was deeply moved'): in classical Greek it is used of the snorting of horses (Aesch. *Theb.* 461). So again the word rendered *sent him out* or *thrust him out* is an unexpectedly violent expression, and—more remarkable still—certain important authorities (D, Old Latin, and the Diatessaron) read in v 41 *being angry* instead of *being moved with compassion*, and on the principle that the more difficult reading is to be preferred, it is possible or probable that they represent the original.[2] But if so, why does the Evangelist represent our Lord as being angry?

It is noteworthy that the section immediately precedes a collection of anecdotes (ii 1—iii 6) designed to illustrate the growth of hostility towards our Lord on the part of Pharisees and scribes. These are essential to the plan of the Gospel, as making intelligible the crucifixion; and, moreover, in Gentile-Christian circles they had a special value because they could be interpreted as dispensing Christians in principle from the observance of Jewish fasts (ii 18–22), and from the obligation to keep the Sabbath (ii 23—iii 6), as a later episode might be interpreted as exempting them from Jewish regulations about food (vii 19).

Mk himself of course stands in principle for the liberty of the Gentiles, and writes primarily for the Gentile Church: but like S. Paul he is by birth and upbringing a Jew, and for him too 'the law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good' (Rom. vii 12). Moreover, he feels it important to establish that the charges of law-breaking brought against Jesus by His enemies are false charges. It is probably with this object that he introduces this episode just where he does: and if so, the purport of it will be to illustrate our Lord's fidelity to the Law, and the displeasure of Jesus will be due to the illegal action of the leper.

---

[1] This act no doubt made a profound impression. It was not illegal, though it involved ceremonial defilement, like touching a corpse. But leprosy is horribly repulsive, and those who have travelled in the East affirm that only those who have witnessed the hideous spectacle of an oriental beggar's sores can appreciate its loathsomeness.

[2] Both Mt and Lk agree in omitting the words rendered *strictly charged him* and *being moved with compassion*; which suggests that they were puzzled by the passage. If either or both of them had had the reading *being moved with compassion* in their text of Mk, it is probable that one or both of them would have taken it over. This confirms the view that *being angry* represents the original reading in Mk.

Nor is it necessary to suppose that this represents merely the point of view of the Evangelist. To our Lord also, in His earthly life as a Jew among Jews, the Law was *the commandment of God* (Mk vii 8); unable to resist the appeal of human need even in the case of one who, in the very act of making his appeal, was transgressing the Law, He yet showed Himself deeply moved, and perhaps indignant, at the man's behaviour.

The leper had apparently come to our Lord in a house—that was part of his offence: he is thrust out and despatched to Jerusalem (only there could the prescribed sacrifices be offered): he is to get a proper certificate from the priests which he can subsequently produce to all and sundry *for a testimony unto them*, i.e. as an evidence that he is now in a fit state to be received back into human society. Meanwhile he is to observe strict secrecy, since the Lord does not desire notoriety as a healer of lepers.[1] According to the usual interpretation of the verse which follows, the Lord's command is disobeyed, with the result that the man's indiscreet zeal in 'publishing the word' (so Gk.) makes it impossible for Jesus any longer to move freely in public without being thronged, at any rate in the particular 'city' (read *the city* rather than *a city*) to which the leper belonged.

An alternative view is suggested by W. C. Allen, who points out that the ordinary rendering involves a harsh change of subject, disguised in the English version by the substitution of *Jesus* for *he*. He thinks the whole of *v.* 45 refers to our Lord and 'means that He (Jesus) went out, and began to preach much, and to publish the word of the good tidings (as in ii 2), with the result that his preaching attracted to Him great multitudes. This caused Him to avoid cities, and to keep in the open, where the multitude could have easy access to Him.'

On the whole the more usual view appears the more probable: Mk does not write as a literary man, and the change of subject is quite in his manner.[2]

40. There is strong MS. authority for reading here, as in Mt viii 2, Lk v 12, *Lord, if thou wilt*, as the form of address. The addition of *Lord* is commonly thought to be due to assimilation to the text of Mt, but it appears in MSS. representing the three distinct textual traditions of Egypt, Africa (i.e. Carthage), and Caesarea,[3] and may have been accidentally dropped from the ordinary texts.

---

[1] On the injunctions of secrecy in this Gospel see Additional Notes, pp. 258 sqq.

[2] For the views of different commentators on the whole episode see Additional Notes, p. 256.

[3] Cf. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 309.

CHAPTER II

1–12. *The paralytic at Capernaum*

(Cf. Mt ix 1–8; Lk v 17–26)

1 And when he entered again into Capernaum after some
2 days, it was noised that he was in the house.[1] And many
were gathered together, so that there was no longer room
for them, no, not even about the door: and he spake the word
3 unto them. And they come, bringing unto him a man sick
4 of the palsy, borne of four. And when they could not
come nigh unto him[2] for the crowd, they uncovered the
roof where he was: and when they had broken it up, they
5 let down the bed whereon the sick of the palsy lay. And
Jesus seeing their faith saith unto the sick of the palsy, Son,[3]
6 thy sins are forgiven. But there were certain of the scribes
7 sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts, Why doth this
man thus speak? he blasphemeth: who can forgive sins but
8 one, *even* God? And straightway Jesus, perceiving in his
spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, saith unto
9 them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether
is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven;
or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk?
10 But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power[4]
on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy),
11 I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy
12 house. And he arose, and straightway took up the bed, and
went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all
amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this
fashion.

[1] Or, *at home*; or simply, *indoors*.
[2] Many ancient authorities read, *bring him unto him*.
[3] Gk. *Child*.
[4] Or, *authority*.

As compared with other forms of religion current in the Graeco-Roman world, Christianity was distinguished by its doctrine of forgiveness.[1] *The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins* was the Church's great characteristic word. From the standpoint of

---

[1] Cf. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, 180 n.

Judaism such a message was an anticipation of the issues of the coming Judgement—that is partly why S. Paul describes it as 'justification' (i. e. '*a verdict of acquittal*'). Furthermore, the title *Son of Man*, as applied to our Lord, carried with it primarily the suggestion of His future coming in Judgement.[1]

Now, in the paragraph before us, the Lord is represented as exercising, even upon earth, the prerogative of divine forgiveness. That is why the scribes murmur in their hearts the charge of blasphemy—the standing reproach of Judaism against the Gospel. The Lord heals the paralytic's body, but before doing so, He pronounces him forgiven: and the bodily healing, when it takes place, is treated as an evident token, a kind of external proof, of the reality of his deliverance from the spiritual paralysis of sin. We infer, therefore, that from the standpoint of the Evangelist the episode is not merely intended to afford the first hint of incipient opposition towards our Lord. It is meant also, and perhaps primarily, as a vindication of the Church's great dogmatic claim to declare the forgiveness of sins in the name of Jesus (cf. Jn xx 22–23). It was, moreover, the experience of the Church in apostolic days that when the great message was proclaimed in the name of the Son of Man, *the Lord worked with them, and confirmed the word by the signs which followed* (Mk xvi 20).

But though this is plainly the meaning of the incident from the standpoint of the Evangelist, as it is its spiritual meaning for us to-day, there are great difficulties about it if it is taken as a record of history, precisely as it stands. One difficulty is connected with the Lord's open identification of Himself with the Son of Man. That our Lord on occasions used this title, and that in doing so He applied it to Himself, need not be doubted. That He did so only in the later stages of His ministry, subsequently to S. Peter's confession (Mk viii 29) is a modern theory which the Evangelist did not share, as this story shows. The difficulty lies not in the mere fact of the use of the title Son of Man, but in the open and explicit avowal, in the presence of His enemies and in terms which could hardly be misunderstood, of the claim to exercise upon earth a divine prerogative.

It is a further difficulty that the miracle of outward healing here appears to be worked primarily as a sign—a sort of argument to convince opponents—in strong contrast both with our Lord's refusal elsewhere to vouchsafe any 'sign' (Mk viii 11 sqq.), and also with the general character of His works of mercy towards the sick, which seem to be pure acts of compassion, wrought wholly for the sufferers' sake, and not with a view to any further end.

Yet a third difficulty arises from the fact that the narrative as it stands lends colour to the suggestion that our Lord shared the current belief of contemporary Judaism that disease was the result of sin.

---

[1] See Introduction, pp. liii sq.

As a general theory this conflicts both with the truth of things and also with what we are able to gather from other passages as to our Lord's mind (cf. Lk xiii 1–5, Jn ix 2). It may be argued, of course, that the Lord read the mind of the sufferer, or gathered from something that he said that he was troubled in conscience;[1] but there is nothing in the text itself to suggest this.

It has been proposed by Wellhausen and others to eliminate the first of the above-mentioned difficulties by assuming that the phrase *son of man*, in the Aramaic original which they suppose to underlie the passage, meant, in this context, simply *man*. On this view, the scribes will have said, or rather thought, 'Only God in heaven can forgive sins': to which our Lord will have replied 'You are mistaken; man on earth can forgive sins also, as I will prove to you'. This is linguistically possible, and in support of it may be quoted Mt ix 8: but I cannot persuade myself that it does justice to the context, or to the thought of the Evangelist. The argument surely is not that the scribes are wrong in their general position that only God can forgive man's sins against Himself: it is rather that, *although the scribes are right* in their general position, nevertheless the Son of Man, as God's representative, can declare the forgiveness of man's sins. It is, once more, a question not of the mere use of the particular title 'Son of Man', but of the exercise of a divine prerogative.

On the whole the difficulties of the passage seem to be best met by the supposition of Loisy and others that the story in its original form told simply how the man was healed of his disease. The awkward intrusion of *he saith to the sick of the palsy* in parenthesis in verse 10, taking up and repeating the same phrase which had occurred already in verse 5, is rather a clumsiness of style than an echo of the vivid description of some eyewitness, and may possibly betray an insertion: for if the words *saith to the sick of the palsy* be read once only, and not twice, and if all the words between the two occurrences of the phrase in our present text be omitted, the resulting narrative runs smoothly and straightforwardly without them. This is not to say that verses 5 b–10 are an interpolation *in the text of Mk*: on the contrary, *for the Evangelist* the story will already have been traditional in the form in which he gives it.[2] We may suppose that the episode of the paralytic came to be expanded in Christian preaching in such a way as to convey the lesson that bodily healing is but a sacrament of the more important healing of the soul, and that the controversial element came in as an echo of early Christian controversy with the synagogue. Such a process would be parallel to the 'midrashic' expansions of O.T. narratives which were used for homiletic purposes in the Jewish synagogue.[1]

---

[1] For an interpretation in terms of modern psycho-analytic theories see E. R. Micklem, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, pp. 85 sqq.

[2] It is possible that for this particular story the Evangelist follows a *written* source: if the source were originally written in Aramaic, it would then be possible to accept Wellhausen's conjecture in verse 4.

1. *In the house* or *at home.* The house may have been S. Peter's; but in many of these Marcan anecdotes the scene is only vaguely indicated as a 'house', a 'desert', a 'mountain', a 'synagogue', or 'by the lake'. We must suppose a flat-roofed house, one story high, perhaps with a courtyard in front, which was entered by a 'door'. Our Lord is indoors, in a room opening on to the courtyard, which is packed with people, the entrance from the street being thronged also.

3. The patient is borne on a pallet-bed by four bearers. Unable to approach the door, they go round to the back of the house and mount by a ladder or possibly by an external staircase[2] to the roof, subsequently hoisting up the sick man on his stretcher by means of ropes.

4. The process of digging through the roof is very difficult to imagine. There is some textual evidence for the omission of the word translated *when they had broken it up*, and Wellhausen, assuming an Aramaic original, supposes that *uncovered the roof* is a mistranslation of a phrase meaning 'brought him up to the roof'—a conjecture which has been accepted by Montefiore and others. On the other hand, the sequel implies (verses 11–12) that the patient had somehow been lowered again from the roof to the ground-floor of the house.

5. *Son.* The Gk. here has *Child*, a form of affectionate address.

7. Montefiore protests with justice against the assertion of Menzies that from the scribes' point of view 'sin could only be forgiven by offering a sacrifice and having absolution formally pronounced by the priest'. I doubt whether there is any evidence of Jewish priests pronouncing 'absolution'. The sin-offerings of the O.T. covered only unintentional offences, and were regarded mainly as cleansing from pollution. Side by side with this, contemporary Pharisaism recognized fully the possibility and the fact of the forgiveness of sin by the free mercy of God on condition of penitence.[3]

9. From the point of view of the scribes it was easy, though blasphemous, to declare the man's sins forgiven, but less easy for a charlatan to cure a sick man, since the result would supply ocular demonstration either of failure or of success. According to the mind of Christ the bodily healing was a minor matter as compared with the spiritual benefit.

11–12. The word for 'bed' is a vulgar one, and implies a poor man's pallet. Commentators compare a story from Lucian of the cure of a man from snake-bite, where it is said, 'And Midas picked up with his own hands the bed on which he had been carried, and went off to the fields', i. e. to his day's work (Lucian, *Philops.* 11).

---

[1] See Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp. 95 sqq.

[2] Lagrange observes that many ancient houses in the East had such staircases mounting up to the roof.

[3] Cf. Abrahams, *op. cit.* i, pp. 139 sqq.

13–14. *The toll-collector Levi*

(Cf. Mt ix 9; Lk v 27–28)

13 And he went forth again by the sea side; and all the multi-
14 tude resorted unto him, and he taught them. And as he
passed by, he saw Levi the *son* of Alphaeus sitting at the
place of toll, and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he
arose and followed him.

The teaching by the lake-side no doubt took place in the neighbourhood of Capernaum. If Capernaum = *Khân Minyeh*, it was on the trade-route from Damascus, and seems to have been the first *town* in Herod's dominions which the traveller would encounter. The *Tell Hûm* site lay about three miles farther off to the NE., and was not on the main road from Damascus. It would, however, be the first town reached by a traveller coming round the Lake from the territory of Philip; so that there would probably in either case be a *douane* there. Levi would be in the service of Herod Antipas, not an employé of one of the provincial contractors or *publicani* who collected the taxes in Judaea. His profession was none the less an unpopular one, since it involved unrestricted intercourse with Gentiles, and was seldom conducted with clean hands, whether in a ceremonial or in any other sense. The call of a tax-collector to be one of the immediate followers of Jesus no doubt created a sensation, and may have caused considerable scandal. Mk narrates it here in order to lead up to the general subject of our Lord's intercourse with tax-collectors and sinners—a second cause of offence to His opponents.

The compiler of Mt identifies Levi with Matthew, who was of the number of the Twelve. It is not certain that Mk means us to do so. The Western Text (D) substitutes for Levi '*James* the son of Alphaeus': it is not likely that this reading is right, but it is evidence that the early scribe responsible for it did not take Levi as identical with Matthew. In the list of the Twelve in Mk iii 16 sqq. the latter is not described as a toll-collector, nor is he called *son of Alphaeus*, or placed next to the 'James' who is so described, as we should have expected on the assumption that the two were brothers. There is, of course, no need to assume that our Lord's personal followers were always limited to twelve (see below on verse 15). On the other hand the description of Levi's call certainly gives the impression, especially when read in the light of Mk i 16–20, that the call is that of an 'Apostle'. The traditional view that Levi and Matthew are identical assumes either that he bore the double name, or that he was renamed by our Lord: if so, Mk mentions him again in iii 18, this time as 'Matthew', without explaining the change of name, which is perhaps assumed as a fact well known.

15–17. *Jesus at table with sinners*

(Cf. Mt ix 10–13; Lk v 29–32)

15 And it came to pass, that he was sitting at meat in his house, and many publicans[1] and sinners sat down with Jesus and his disciples: for there were many, and they
16 followed him. And the scribes of the Pharisees,[2] when they saw that he was eating with the sinners and publicans,[1] said unto his disciples,[3] He eateth and drinketh[4] with
17 publicans[1] and sinners. And when Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that are whole[5] have no need of a physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.

[1] Translate, *tax-collectors.*
[2] Some ancient authorities read *and the Pharisees.*
[3] Or, How is it *that he eateth . . . sinners?*
[4] Some ancient authorities omit *and drinketh.*
[5] Gr. *strong.*

W. C. Allen argues strongly in favour of the view that our Lord, and not Levi, is the host at this meal, the 'house' being that in which He stayed at Capernaum, and in which He was 'at home'. It is more likely that the usual view is correct, and that Levi, at some time subsequent to his call to 'follow', is entertaining our Lord with other guests, including some of his old profession (cf. Lk v 29). The term *publicans* is a tradition from the Vulgate rendering *publicani*, which was the name given to the contractors who farmed the public taxes under the Empire. It is quite unsuitable as a description of the officials referred to in the Gospels, who are merely the small fry of the bureaucracy, the ordinary tax-collectors and customs-officers. Their dubious reputation was not confined to Palestine, since they are coupled with 'adulterers and panders, flatterers and sycophants' by the pagan writer Lucian (*Nekyom.* 11). By the term *sinners* might be meant, in a Jewish context, simply persons who consorted with Gentiles, or perhaps were themselves of Gentile origin (cf. Gal ii 15); or again, those who by their deeds had put themselves beyond the pale of the Law, and were technically excommunicated from the Synagogue. I. Abrahams contends that it refers not to those who neglected the rules of ritual piety, but to persons of immoral life, remarking that 'the Rabbis would have been chary of intercourse with such men at all times, but especially at meals'.[1] Jewish scholars insist that it is a libel to suggest that the Synagogue did not welcome repentant sinners. 'There was in the Pharisaism of all ages a real anxiety to make the return of the sinner easy', though 'it was inclined to leave the initiative to the sinner, except that it always maintained God's readiness to take the first step.'[2] Montefiore, however, admits, and Abrahams also, though more grudgingly, that there was in our Lord's attitude towards sinners something really new and original, in that '*He did not avoid sinners, but sought them out*'.[3]

15–16. Swete puts a full stop after *many*, and translates 'for there were many (publicans and sinners). And scribes of the Pharisees followed Him also (to the banquet)'. It is more probable that R.V. punctuates rightly, and that the construction is an example of semitic parataxis (so Wellhausen). The meaning will then be 'For there were ⟨now⟩ many ⟨disciples⟩ who followed Jesus'.

16. *Scribes of the Pharisees* is a phrase found only here, but it is probably the right reading. It means scribes (i.e. professional exponents of the Law) who belonged to the Pharisaic party: there is no need to assume that all scribes did so. The Pharisees, who appear here for the first time in Mk, were the stricter party in Judaism, who accepted the oral tradition as equally binding with the written Law. Their faults were the besetting faults of respectably religious people everywhere; and our Lord denounced them, or some of them, as 'hypocrites'. But it is important to distinguish between the proverbial and the historical meanings of the term 'Pharisee'.[4] The remark of the Pharisees here is an exclamation of surprise, and should not be read as a question. The words *and drinketh* are probably not part of the true text.

17. Our Lord quotes a popular proverb, to which Swete supplies a parallel from Pausanias. A doctor must go where he is needed, and a physician of the soul must no more be afraid of contagion than a physician of the body. If Allen were right in thinking that our Lord was the host on this occasion, the word rendered *call* might be taken as meaning *invite*: to invite 'sinners' to the Great Banquet of the Kingdom was precisely the Lord's mission (for this sense of *I came* cf. Mt xxi 32 of the mission of John). Lk glosses the invitation by the addition of the words *to repentance*, which a few MSS. read here wrongly in the text of Mk. To ask whether the saying of our Lord implies the existence of any 'righteous' who needed no repentance is a foolish pedantry which misunderstands the character of

---

[1] *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* i, p. 55.

[2] Abrahams, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

[3] Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* i, p. 86.

[4] For discriminating accounts of Pharisaism see Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp. 120 sqq.; also Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, pt. i, chap. vii. R. T. Herford in *Pharisaism* (1912) and *The Pharisees* (1924) is unduly eulogistic of the Pharisees, but may be read with profit if allowance be made for this.

the context, in which both 'righteous' and 'sinners' are ironical echoes of the terminology of our Lord's opponents. J. Weiss thinks that the words were not spoken by our Lord at all, but are an explanation supplied by the Evangelist, viz. Jesus did not come *into the world* to call the righteous, but to call sinners. But this seems quite gratuitous.

18–20. *The question about fasting*

(Cf. Mt ix 14–15; Lk v 33–35)

18 And John's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting: and
they come and say unto him, Why do John's disciples
and the disciples of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples
19 fast not? And Jesus said unto them, Can the sons of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? as long
as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast.
20 But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken
away from them, and then will they fast in that day.

This episode forms the third in Mk's collection of 'conflict' stories. The first clause of verse 18 is peculiar to Mk, which suggests that Mt and Lk may not have read it in the form of Mk which they had before them. It is possibly an explanatory note inserted subsequently in Mk's text. The verb which follows is impersonal (so often in Mk) and means 'people came to Him, and said . . .'. Montefiore thinks, probably rightly, that the phrases *and the Pharisees* and *and the disciples of the Pharisees* in this verse are editorial insertions intended to fit the section into its context as an example of conflict between the Pharisees and our Lord. The original contrast will have been simply between the practice of John's disciples and that of the disciples of Jesus. For the contrast between John and our Lord as regards asceticism cf. Mt xi 18–19.

The practice of the Church when this Gospel was written differed already from that of the Synagogue as regards fasting. According to the *Didache*[1] Christians fasted on Wednesdays and Fridays, whereas 'the hypocrites' (i. e. the Jews) did so on Tuesdays and Thursdays (cf. Lk xviii 12). This would, of course, represent a rather later practice. It is possible, though not certain, that Friday, as the day on which 'the Bridegroom' was 'taken away', may have already been observed as a fast in the Christian Church; but Mk's main interest in this story, apart from its significance as an example of

---

[1] *Didache* viii 1.

'conflict', is no doubt due to the fact that it could be interpreted as exempting Christians from Jewish fasts.

Wellhausen is sceptical about the whole incident, regarding it as an *ex post facto* attempt to justify the Church in adopting from the sect of John's disciples after Jesus' death a custom of fasting which the Master had not observed. J. Weiss thinks that the question put to our Lord and the words in reply *Can the sons of the bride-chamber fast?* may be authentic, and that our Lord means that for Him and for His disciples the joy of the heavenly Feast (a common figure in Judaism for the Day of Salvation) has already begun. The remainder of the words, with their evident allusion to the Lord's death, he regards as a dogmatic embellishment of the original saying.

The story, however, if we abandon the quite needless supposition that Mk's arrangement of his materials is chronological, and assume that this episode happened soon after the Baptist's death, is intelligible as it stands. The fast which the disciples of John were observing is not an ordinary Jewish fast: it is an expression of mourning for their master.[1] It might have been anticipated that our Lord and His disciples would have joined in the observance, but they did not. The Lord is asked why, and replies by pointing out that His disciples, unlike those of John, have not lost their 'Bridegroom'—as yet! They are still in the enjoyment of the marriage feast. The fate of the Fore-runner was none the less an omen (cf. Mt xvii 12). It is difficult not to feel that we have here an entirely appropriate occasion for the first overt foreboding of coming death.

19. A wedding feast in antiquity lasted several days (cf. Jdg xiv 12). *Sons of the bride-chamber*: the phrase reflects a semitic idiom and appears to denote the companions of the bridegroom, a kind of masculine equivalent of our 'bridesmaids': perhaps it may be rendered 'groomsmen'. See, however, Additional Notes, p. 256. There is good MS. authority for the omission of the words *as long as they have the bridegroom with them they cannot fast*, which look like a gloss, and are missing from the parallel passages in Mt and Lk.

21–22. *The old and the new*

(Cf. Mt ix 16–17; Lk v 36–38)

21 No man seweth a piece of undressed cloth on an old garment: else that which should fill it up taketh from it, the
22 new from the old, and a worse rent is made. And no man putteth new wine into old wine-skins:[1] else the wine will

[1] That is, *skins used as bottles.*

---

[1] That the motive of the fast under discussion was sorrow and not asceticism is implied by the whole tenor of Jesus' words.

burst the skins, and the wine perisheth, and the skins: but *they put* new wine into fresh wine-skins.

In the context in which Mk has placed them, these two sayings drive home the point that it had proved impossible for the Christian Church—or, at least, for the Gentile-Christian Church—to express its religious life through the ancient forms of Judaism, without being cramped thereby. The new wine had burst the old wine-skins; the new patch had destroyed the old garment. The sayings in themselves are little parables about the relation between old and new. We do not know—and it is idle to guess—in what context they were originally spoken. They are characteristic sayings of Jesus, unforgettable in their homely vividness and power.

21. The R.V. translation is needlessly literal. The word rendered *undressed* means literally 'unbleached' or 'uncarded' (of wool); but it occurs in the sense of 'new' in a papyrus of the second century A. D., in which a borrower pledges a 'new white shirt' for an advance of 11 drachmae. *That which should fill it up* is a paraphrase rather than a translation of a word which should be rendered 'patch'. Wellhausen thinks the words *the new from the old* are an explanatory gloss.[1] The new cloth used for the patch has apparently not been 'shrunk'. The garment gets wet, the patch shrinks, and it is the garment that suffers.

22. The new wine, or rather 'must', ferments in the skins, which if hard and dry are burst in the process. New wine-skins have more 'give' in them, and will stretch. The last clause should be translated 'New skins for new wine!' and is perhaps a popular proverb. It is omitted by D and Old Lat., but is probably a genuine part of the text (so Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 311). C. H. Turner thinks the words *else the wine . . . and the skins* should be read as a parenthesis, and *but new wine into fresh wine-skins* as continuing the previous part of the sentence.

23–28. *The Sabbath*

(Cf. Mt xii 1–8; Lk vi 1–5)

23 And it came to pass, that he was going on the sabbath day
through the cornfields; and his disciples began, as they
24 went, to pluck[1] the ears of corn. And the Pharisees said
unto him, Behold, why do they on the sabbath day that
25 which is not lawful? And he said unto them, Did ye never

[1] Gk. *began to make* their *way plucking.*

---

[1] But they seem already to have stood in Lk's copy of Mk (cf. Lk v 36).

read what David did, when he had need, and was an
26 hungred, he, and they that were with him? How he
entered into the house of God when Abiathar was high
priest,[1] and did eat the shewbread, which it is not lawful to
eat save for the priests, and gave also to them that were
27 with him? And he said unto them, The sabbath was made
28 for man, and not man for the sabbath: so that the Son of
man is lord even of the sabbath.

[1] Some ancient authorities read *in the days of Abiathar the high priest.*

The Sabbath, when this Gospel was written, was not observed by Gentile Christians,[1] and no doubt this anecdote and the one which follows it were regarded as justifying their freedom. In the story itself, however, the obligation of the Sabbath is assumed, both by our Lord and by His opponents. The dispute turns upon the question whether, and in what circumstances, the Law admitted of exceptions. To pluck and eat a neighbour's corn, provided it was not reaped with a sickle, was allowed by Dt xxiii 25; to do so on the Sabbath could only be unlawful if it infringed the Sabbath rest. The Pharisees presumably regarded the disciples' action as equivalent to 'reaping', one of the thirty-nine activities traditionally forbidden upon the Sabbath.[2] Our Lord might have challenged this interpretation, since it depended not directly upon the Law, but upon oral traditions which He did not personally accept. He prefers to admit, for the sake of argument, a breach of the Law, but to allege as a sufficient justification the disciples' hunger, arguing that in exceptional cases the Law (as witness the episode of 1 Sam xxi 1–6) might justly be regarded as subordinate to human needs.

The Evangelist appends to the discussion a saying of Jesus from some other context (for the phrase *and He said unto them* as a connecting link in such cases cf. iv 11, 13, vii 9, ix 1), in which the principle is applied to the Sabbath in general terms. The last verse of the section is probably best understood as a Christian comment, 'So, then, the Son of Man is "Lord" even in respect of the Sabbath!'

23. Lagrange remarks that harvests in Galilee would be ripe towards the end of May. R.V. mg. is needlessly literal: the Gk. phrase used would ordinarily mean 'to make a path', but here it means simply 'to walk', like the Latin *iter facere.* It is not necessarily a Latinism, since it is used in this sense in the LXX (Jdgs xvii 8). Bacon translates 'to make a road by plucking', and thinks

---

[1] By the time of Ignatius of Antioch (*c.* 110 A. D.) it was a point of principle 'not to keep the Sabbath, but to live according to the Lord's Day' (Ignat. *ad Magnes.* ix 1). The sabbatarian interpretation of the Lord's Day itself is of course much later.

[2] Cf. Schürer II ii 97.

the disciples' offence was that of road-making! It is much more likely that the party walked by a regular path through the fields, plucking ears by the wayside as they went.

25. It is over-subtle to see in our Lord's question a veiled messianic claim, as though David and his men corresponded to the Messiah and His disciples: the interpretation given above is the natural one.

26. The text of Samuel does not imply that David himself entered into the sanctuary, or that his men were with him when he interviewed the priest. Our Lord appears to follow a traditional Jewish 'haggada' or expansion of the O.T. story. The priest concerned was Ahimelech, not Abiathar. V. H. Stanton thinks the words *when Abiathar was high priest* are 'an addition by a badly informed copyist'.[1] The Midrash on 1 Sam xxi supposes the incident to have occurred on the Sabbath, which would give added point to our Lord's use of it. For shewbread or 'bread of the Presence' see Ex xxv 30, Lev xxiv 5–9. Bacon remarks that 'the inconsistency of the narrative of the Books of Samuel with the priestly law (really due to the much later development of the latter) had been observed, but was explained as due to exceptional circumstances'.

27. 'The Sabbath is delivered unto you, and ye are not delivered to the Sabbath' was a rabbinical commonplace, ascribed in different contexts to two different Jewish teachers.[2] It is probable that some at least of the Palestinian Rabbis would not have very greatly disagreed with our Lord in His view of the present incident.[3] Doubtless then, as now, rigid views existed side by side with more liberal tendencies.

28. Wellhausen proposes here, as in ii 10, to take *Son of man* as a mistranslation of an Aramaic phrase for 'man', and to regard the words in this form as having been spoken by our Lord. But even if the Evangelist was following an Aramaic source, he must have been conscious of what he was doing in rendering 'man' in verse 27 and 'Son of man' in verse 28. Moreover our Lord would not have been likely to say that 'man' was 'lord of the Sabbath', which had been instituted by God. On the other hand it is almost equally unlikely that He would have emphasized His personal lordship of the Sabbath. The words therefore are best explained (see above) as a Christian comment.

---

[1] *The Gospels as Historical Documents* ii, p. 145.

[2] D and Old Lat. omit v. 27, and it is missing from the parallel passages in Mt and Lk. It is therefore possible that it did not stand in the original text of Mk, though the balance of existing MS. authority is in its favour. It may have been inserted as a well-known saying, relevant to our Lord's argument.

[3] Cf. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* i, pp. 129 sqq.

CHAPTER III

1–6. *Healing on the Sabbath*

(Cf. Mt xii 9–14 ; Lk vi 6–11)

1 And he entered again into the synagogue ; and there was
2 a man there which had his hand withered. And they
watched him, whether he would heal him on the sabbath
3 day ; that they might accuse him. And he saith unto the
4 man that had his hand withered, Stand forth.[1] And he
saith unto them, Is it lawful on the sabbath day to do good,
or to do harm ? to save a life, or to kill ? But they held
5 their peace. And when he had looked round about on them
with anger, being grieved at the hardening of their heart,
he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he
6 stretched it forth : and his hand was restored. And the
Pharisees went out, and straightway with the Herodians
took counsel against him, how they might destroy him.

[1] Gr. *Arise into the midst.*

Healing on the Sabbath was regarded as lawful by the Pharisees only when life was actually in danger.[1] ‘Jesus differed fundamentally . . . in that he asserted a general right to abrogate the Sabbath law for man’s ordinary convenience’.[2] It is noteworthy that the Lord’s capacity to heal is taken for granted, as much by His opponents as by Himself. He is now being watched, in the hope that He will break the Sabbath, an offence for which the Law enjoined the penalty of death (Ex xxxi 14). On the other hand, there is no reason to suppose with Bennett[3] that the man with the paralysed arm had been deliberately introduced into the Synagogue as an *agent provocateur.* Jesus, who is credited here as in ii 8 with the capacity to read men’s thoughts, accepts the implicit challenge of His adversaries and bids the man come forward. The double question, by which He vindicates in advance what He intends to do, has been variously interpreted. The argument may be that to let slip an opportunity of doing good is in principle to do evil (cf. Jas iv 17) ; the words which follow (literally, *to save a life or to kill*) might be translated ‘to heal a man or to let him get worse’.[4]

---

[1] Schürer II ii 104 sqq.

[2] Abrahams, *op. cit.* i, p. 134.

[3] *The Life of Jesus according to S. Mark*, p. 40.

[4] On the equivalence of ‘to heal’ and ‘to make alive’ in Semitic thought see W. W. von Baudissin, *Adonis und Esmun*, pp. 397 sqq.

On the other hand, a more pointed sense is secured if with Swete we suppose an allusion to the unavowed intentions of Jesus' enemies. The meaning will then be, 'Who is the real Sabbath-breaker, He who performs a work of mercy, thereby doing good, or those who seek to do an injury, and are in fact plotting murder, as you are doing?' They are silent, and the Lord looks round in mingled anger and compassion at hearts so cold, and bids the man 'stretch forth' his withered hand. The Pharisees consult with the officials of Herod's court with a view to taking proceedings against Jesus.[1]

1. *Withered*: the verb so translated is used in the LXX of the 'drying up' of the hand of Jeroboam (1 Kgs xiii 4–6). The apocryphal *Gospel according to the Hebrews* makes the man explain to Jesus that he was a stone-mason who had to work for his living; he asks that the use of his hand may be restored so that he may not have to beg[2]—a good example of 'midrashic' amplification.

2. *They watched him*: the verb is impersonal as in ii 18—'people were watching'.

5. For Jesus 'looking round' cf. iii 34, v 32, x 23, xi 11. The word rendered *being grieved* in the original suggests compassion. For *hardening* or 'callousness' D and one MS. of the Syriac version read 'deadness'.[3]

6. Mk xii 13 is the only other mention of *Herodians* in the N.T., with the exception of Mt xxii 16, which itself is derived from Mk. That they constituted a distinct sect or party amongst the Jews is most unlikely. Josephus (*Antiquities* XIV xv 10) speaks of a party favourable to Herod the Great in Galilee before the latter had become master of the country: but in the time of our Lord Herod Antipas was tetrarch of Galilee, and all Galilaeans were equally his subjects, though the Herodian dynasty was not popular, least of all with the Pharisees. This would not prevent them from using what influence they may have had with the Government in a particular case, and it seems most natural to interpret *Herodians* here as meaning Herod's *entourage*.

The episode just considered concludes Mk's collection of anecdotes designed to illustrate and explain the nascent opposition of the authorities towards Jesus. It has been remarked by critics that they are artistically arranged so as to lead up to a climax. In ii 6 the scribes made silent criticisms, in ii 16 Pharisaic scribes questioned the disciples, in ii 18 they challenge Jesus Himself, and in iii 6 they are already determined to get rid of Him. It has been supposed by some scholars that Mk is guilty of an anachronism in suggesting that there was any plot against our Lord's life in Galilee, as distinct from the action eventually taken against Him in Jerusalem. But this seems quite arbitrary: our Lord may quite well have incurred the mortal enmity of the Galilaean scribes, and there may even be some truth in the suggestion of Professor Burkitt that the action of our Lord in subsequently moving outside Herod's dominions (Mk vii 24) was dictated by the threatening attitude of the Government.[1] Meanwhile, as though to serve as a foil to the antagonism of the authorities, Mk proceeds to emphasize afresh our Lord's popularity with the multitudes.

---

[1] An accusation before the civil government would hardly lie, since no civil offence had been committed: but the consent of Herod would probably be required for the trial of one of his subjects before the Sanhedrin on a charge of Sabbath-breaking.

[2] Jerome, *Comm. in Mt* xii 13.

[3] The word here rendered *hardening* appears often to be used in biblical Greek in the metaphorical sense of 'obtuseness' or 'moral blindness', and varies in the MSS. of some passages (not, however, here) with a closely similar Greek word meaning 'blindness'. The variant reading 'deadness' in the text probably corresponds closely with the real meaning as understood by some early readers of the Gospel. See J. A. Robinson, *Ephesians*, pp. 264 sqq.

7–12. *Crowds by the Lake side*

(Cf. Mt xii 15–21; Lk vi 17–19)

7 And Jesus with his disciples withdrew to the sea: and
8 a great multitude from Galilee followed: and from Judaea, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumaea, and beyond Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude, hearing what
9 great things he did,[1] came unto him. And he spake to his disciples, that a little boat should wait on him because of
10 the crowd, lest they should throng him: for he had healed many; insomuch that as many as had plagues[2] pressed
11 upon him[3] that they might touch him. And the unclean spirits, whensoever they beheld him, fell down before him,
12 and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. And he charged them much that they should not make him known.

[1] Or, *all the things that he did.* [2] Gr. *scourges.*
[3] Gr. *fell upon him.*

The more the scribes opposed our Lord, the more the people flocked to Him. The scenes described in this short section are probably to be regarded as typical. Mk says that our Lord *withdrew* to the Lake side: probably not as a means of escape from danger, as some commentators suppose, but because He wished for the present to avoid further controversy with opponents, and yet to be readily accessible to the people. By this time He has become famous, and not only in Galilee (cf. i 28); for besides the Galilaeans who

---

[1] Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 90 sqq.

'followed' Him, visitors are described as 'coming' from more distant parts of the country, attracted mainly by His fame as a healer. There would seem to have been a popular belief that, as Lk vi 19 expresses it, a 'power' or 'virtue' went out from Him even without His conscious co-operation (cf. Mk v 30, vi 56), with the result that the sick almost 'fall upon Him' (verse 10 mg.) in their anxiety to touch Him. On these occasions the Lord would have a small boat in attendance (verse 9; here first mentioned, but subsequently referred to as 'the boat': cf. iv 1), in order to extricate Himself from the crowds at will. For the demons and their recognition of Jesus see notes on i 24, 34, and Introduction, pp. xlix sq.; for the injunctions of secrecy see Additional Notes, pp. 258 sqq.

7–8. R.V. punctuation of the accepted text[1] is probably right in assuming a distinction between the Galilaean multitude who *followed* and the multitude from farther afield who *came unto* him. The capital Jerusalem is distinguished from the district or province of Judaea generally: Idumaea, the O.T. Edom, had been conquered by the Jews under John Hyrcanus *c.* 128 B.C., and the inhabitants compelled to accept circumcision, so that it now ranked as a Jewish land. *Beyond Jordan* refers to the district known as 'Peraea' (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* III iii 3), between the Arnon and the Jabbok. The relations between Tyre and Sidon and Upper Galilee were at all times close, and both towns had a considerable Jewish population, though they were outside Jewish territory proper. It is noteworthy that no pilgrims are represented as coming from Samaria.

10. *Plagues* (lit: 'scourges'). The word is used again of the 'issue of blood' in v 29, 34—an episode which some critics think was in the Evangelist's mind when he wrote the generalized account of healings here: there are parallels in classical Greek literature (Homer and Aeschylus): in all probability the word was current in Hellenistic Greek as a synonym for 'disease'. It is not necessary to assume that its use implies the theological theory that disease is a 'chastisement' for sin.

11. *Fell down before him*, i. e. the demoniacs did so, the demons, who were supposed to control them, being credited with their actions. Apparently the demons are represented as paying our Lord involuntary homage.

Son of God: on this title see Introduction, p. li.

13–19 a. *The Twelve*

(Cf. Mt x 2–4; Lk vi 12–16)

13 And he goeth up into the mountain, and calleth unto him
14 whom he himself would: and they went unto him. And he

---

[1] C. H. Turner thinks that *followed* should be omitted here from the text, with D and other MS. authorities (*The Study of the New Testament: an inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford*, pp. 58–59).

appointed twelve,[1] that they might be with him, and that
15 he might send them forth to preach, and to have authority
16 to cast out devils:[2] and[3] Simon he surnamed Peter; and
17 James the *son* of Zebedee, and John the brother of James;
18 and them he surnamed Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder:
and Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew,
and Thomas, and James the *son* of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus,
19 and Simon the Cananaean,[4] and Judas Iscariot, which also
betrayed him.

[1] Some ancient authorities add *whom also he named apostles.* [2] Gr. *demons.*
[3] Some ancient authorities insert *and he appointed the twelve.* [4] Or, *Zealot.*

With regard to the reading *whom also he called apostles* in verse 14 C. H. Turner remarks that it is 'a quite clear intrusion into S. Mark from Lk vi 13. "Apostle" began to supersede "the Twelve" in the second Christian generation in Gentile circles as a Greek word, and a word which permitted the inclusion of S. Paul'.[1] The earliest Christianity spoke only of 'the Twelve' (1 Cor xv 5)—a group of chosen disciples selected by our Lord, whose number stood in relation to that of the 'twelve tribes of Israel' (Mt xix 28, Lk xxii 30), and symbolized the mission of the Messiah to His own people. Mk's readers, it is assumed, will naturally be interested to know their names; and the position which they afterwards came to hold in the Christian Church is here traced back to their selection and appointment by our Lord. It would seem, however, that by the time the Gospels came to be written some at least of the Twelve were little more than names in the Christian tradition, and that there was even some uncertainty as to who they were. The lists as given by the three Synoptists (cf. also Acts i 13) agree substantially as regards eleven of the names, but Mt substitutes Lebbaeus for Mk's Thaddaeus, while Lk has neither of these names, but agrees with the Fourth Evangelist in recognizing a second Judas distinct from the traitor Iscariot (Lk vi 16, Jn xiv 22). The Fourth Gospel moreover includes among our Lord's more intimate disciples a certain Nathanael, recruited by Philip (Jn i 45, sqq. xxi 2), who does not appear, at least under that name, in any of the Synoptic lists.

It is probable that the *mise-en-scène* in verse 13 is due to the Evangelist. B. W. Bacon suggests that *the mountain* here means the upper plateau of Galilee generally, rather than any particular peak. Mt uses this 'mountain' as the scene of the 'Sermon' (Mt 5–7), which Lk represents rather as being delivered on a 'level place' (Lk vi 17).

---

[1] *Ch. Quarterly Review*, July 1920, p. 338.

14. *Appointed* (Gr. 'made'): the use of the word 'make' in this sense appears to be a semitism.

14–15. The reference to the 'sending forth' of the Twelve anticipates Mk vi 7 sqq. The Twelve are to have 'authority' from Christ, as He has 'authority' from the Father (see notes on i 21 sqq.). Some manuscripts read *to heal diseases and* after 'authority': but this is probably due to assimilation to the text of Mt x 1. R.V. rightly omits from 15 *and he appointed the twelve*, which many manuscripts repeat from the previous verse.[1]

16. *Simon he surnamed Peter.* The original name 'Simon' (= the Hebrew 'Symeon') is discarded henceforward in this Gospel (except xiv 37). The new name will have been given in the Aramaic form 'Kephas', of which 'Peter' (= 'Rock' or 'Stone') is a Greek rendering. Tradition varied as to the occasion or circumstance which led to its bestowal (cf. Mt xvi 18, John i 42). The Matthaean suggestion is the most attractive, since the confession of Jesus' Messiahship by S. Peter would be a natural occasion for our Lord to speak of him as a 'stone' on which He could 'build'. *Boanerges*—'*Boane* is apparently an awkward transliteration of the Semitic "sons of", which should have only one vowel between *b* and *n*. *-rges* in the sense "thunder" is unknown' (W. C. Allen). If the nickname signified 'impetuous' or 'angry men', it may be explained by the episode of Lk ix 54. The two sons of Zebedee are placed next to S. Peter, separating him from his brother Andrew, since 'Peter and James and John' seem to have been our Lord's special intimates (cf. v 37, ix 2, xiv 33).

18. *Bartholomew* is in form a patronymic (= 'son of Ptolemy'?): his identification, on the assumption that he must have had some personal name in addition, with the 'Nathanael' of the Fourth Gospel is a precarious conjecture.[2] *Matthew* (= Mattathias) is not described by Mk as a 'toll-collector', and need not be the same as Levi (see notes on ii 13, 14). *Thomas* is 'called Didymus' ('a twin') in John xi 16, xx 24, xxi 2: the name 'Thomas' in Hebrew already means 'a twin'. *James the son of Alphaeus* = 'James the Little' of xv 40? *Thaddaeus* is probably an aramaized form of a Greek name ('Theudas', 'Theodotus', 'Theodorus'?). Some manuscripts here have 'Lebbaeus', by assimilation from Mt x 3, where conversely some manuscripts read 'Thaddaeus' by assimilation from Mk. McNeile on Mt x 3 thinks the latter is the right reading in both Gospels, but the divergence of the original texts is much more probable, on general principles of textual criticism.

Cananaean, derived not from 'Canaan' or 'Cana', but from a word meaning 'zealous', as Lk vi 15 rightly translates it. The term may be simply a descriptive epithet (cf. Gal i 14, Acts xxi 20), or it may indicate that this Simon had previously belonged to the political sect or party of the 'Zealots', who advocated armed insurrection against Rome (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* IV iii 9, &c.): some scholars, however, believe that the term was not used as a party name before A. D. 66.

---

[1] A. C. Clark regards this reading as 'a dittography of the most puerile description' (*The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, p. 108).

[2] The sole basis of the conjecture appears to be the fact that Philip is associated with Nathanael in the Fourth Gospel (Jn i 43 sqq.), and Bartholomew's name stands next to that of Philip in the Synoptic lists of the Twelve.

19. *Iscariot*, variously explained as meaning 'man of Kerioth' or 'assassin' (*sicarius*, cf. Acts xxi 38): both explanations are, however, extremely doubtful.

It is noteworthy that two of the Twelve (Andrew and Philip) bear purely Greek names, and that the names of several others are Greek in form (e. g. Thomas, Bartholomew, Thaddaeus, Matthew), though semitic or partly semitic in derivation. Galilee appears to have been less hostile towards Greek influences than Jerusalem, and though Aramaic was undoubtedly the vernacular language of our Lord and His disciples, it is probable that both He and they would be able also to speak Greek.[1] The Gospels represent Him as carrying on conversations with a Syro-Phoenician woman (Mk vii 24 sqq., Mt xv 21 sqq.) and with Pilate (Mk xv 2 sqq., Mt xxvii 11 sqq., Lk xxiii 3).[2] J. Weiss thinks not only that Galilee was bilingual in our Lord's time, but that the same was true also of a large part of the population of Jerusalem itself.[3]

19 b–21. *The anxiety of Jesus' friends*

20 And he cometh into a house.[1] And the multitude cometh together again, so that they could not so much as eat bread.
21 And when his friends heard it, they went out to lay hold on him: for they said, He is beside himself.

[1] Or, *home.*

The 'house' to which Jesus came 'home' (R.V. mg.) may have been that of S. Peter at Capernaum. The coming together 'again' of the multitude may refer back to iii 7 or, as others suppose, to ii 2. The pressure of patients demanding healing is such that our Lord has no leisure for food, with the result that when the rumour of what was happening reached his 'friends' (i. e. 'those who belonged to Him', 'His people at home') they set out (from Nazareth?) with the object of restraining Him. If the verb *they said* is to be taken impersonally (so often in Mk—cf. iii 2, ii 18) it refers to the rumour which had reached them ('People are saying that He is out of His mind!'):[1] otherwise the meaning is that those at home themselves began to fear that He must be out of His mind. It is not stated that His Mother shared this verdict, though she accompanies His 'brethren' in iii 31.

---

[1] Cf. G. Dalman, *Jesus-Jeschua*, pp. 5–6.

[2] The centurion at Capernaum (Mt viii 5 sqq., Lk vii 1 sqq.) was presumably in the service of Herod Antipas, and may have spoken Aramaic.

[3] *Das Urchristentum*, pp. 119–120.

Mt and Lk both omit these two verses, though they take over from Mk the sequel (iii 31 sqq. = Mt xii 46 sqq., Lk viii 19 sqq.). Presumably the suggestion that our Lord's own kinsfolk thought Him insane seemed to them too unedifying. Mk is less timid of consequences; and, moreover, it is possible that for him the story even had an apologetic value, since the misunderstanding of Jesus by His own people might be interpreted as typical of the strange blindness which had led the Jewish nation, His 'people' in the wider sense, to reject and misunderstand the true Messiah.

22–30. *The accusation of Jesus' enemies*

(Cf. Mt xii 22–32; Lk xi 14–23)

22 And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, He
hath Beelzebub, and, By[1] the prince of the devils[2] casteth
23 he out the devils.[2] And he called them unto him, and said
24 unto them in parables, How can Satan cast out Satan? And
if a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot
25 stand. And if a house be divided against itself, that house
26 will not be able to stand. And if Satan hath risen up against
himself, and is divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end.
27 But no one can enter into the house of the strong *man*, and
spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong *man*; and
28 then he will spoil his house. Verily I say unto you, All
their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their
29 blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: but
whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath
30 never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin: because
they said, He hath an unclean spirit.

[1] Or, *In*. [2] Gr. *demons*.

It is characteristic of Mk's method of putting his materials together that he occasionally intercalates one episode into the context of another: thus in v 25 sqq. the healing of the woman with an issue of blood is woven into the story of the raising of Jairus' daughter; the story of John's execution (vi 14 sqq.) fills up the interval between the departure of our Lord's disciples in vi 13 and their return after their tour in vi 30; the cleansing of the Temple (xi 15 sqq.) is intercalated into the story about the withering of the fig-tree; and the anointing at Bethany (xiv 3 sqq.) separates the plot on the part of the priests from its sequel in xiv 10 sqq.

---

[1] 'It is more likely that our Lord's relatives should have come to apprehend Him, because they had heard a report that He was beside Himself, than that they should have arrived at such a conclusion for themselves. And it is by no means likely that Mark would have told the story at all, if he had meant what he is usually understood to mean.' (B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 189).

So here, the episode of the coming of our Lord's kinsfolk, who in iii 21 set out and in iii 31 actually arrive, is interrupted by Mk's version of the Beelzebub controversy, which appears to have stood in 'Q', the source common to Mt and Lk, as well as in 'Qᴿ', from which source it is probable that Mk derived it.[1] It is introduced here in order to point a contrast between the well-meant, if mistaken, anxiety of Jesus' friends and the malicious and hostile calumny of His enemies. The mention of the *scribes which came down from Jerusalem* is probably intended to suggest that the attention of the authorities there has already been drawn to our Lord's proceedings, and that emissaries have been sent from the capital to keep the new movement under observation.

That exorcism was not uncommon in contemporary Judaism is implied by Mt xii 27, Lk xi 19. His opponents do not deny our Lord's power, but explain it as being derived from Beelzebub, an idea which would not then have appeared absurd, since the notion of 'black magic' was widely diffused. Our Lord, however, criticizes it upon grounds of reason. To suppose that the kingdom of the evil powers is divided against itself is against common sense. The inference rather is, if demons are cast out, that they have encountered a power superior to their own. Our Lord Himself regards His exorcisms as evidence that the power of Satan has begun to totter (cf. Lk x 18–20). He casts out demons in the power of the Spirit of God (Mt xii 28); and to fail to perceive this—to ascribe to satanic agency a work which was manifestly of God—is to be guilty of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

22. *Beelzebub*: so the Syriac version and the Vulgate—the Gk.

---

[1] That 'Q' contained an account of the Beelzebub controversy is clear from the fact that Mt and Lk, besides taking over the matter included in Mk, have further material on the same subject common to them both. Mt moreover gives the scribes' accusation in two different contexts (Mt ix 34, xii 24). A comparison of Mt ix 32 with Lk xi 14 suggests that the starting-point in 'Q' was a story of the exorcism of a dumb man. Wellhausen, who believed Mk earlier in date than 'Q', argued that his account of the controversy was the more original, but was decisively refuted by B. H. Streeter (*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 169 sqq.). Since the publication of that work, however, the whole problem has been set in a new light by Streeter, who now thinks that 'Q'—a document which he supposes to be connected with Antioch—did not lie before Mk in a written form. I have assumed a source 'Qᴿ'—whether written or oral—as representing the tradition of our Lord's teaching current at Rome. (See Introduction, pp. xxxviii sqq., and Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 186 sqq.).

MSS. all have *Beelzebul*. The god of Ekron was called Beelzebub, and seems to have had an oracular shrine which was regarded as a rival to the oracle of Jehovah (2 Kgs i 2). Etymologically the name might mean 'lord of flies', and since the Aramaic word for 'fly' presented an assonance with the word for 'enemy' it has been suggested that the name of the old pagan god was in current use to denote *the* 'enemy', i. e. Satan. The form *Beelzebul* has been thought to be a deliberate substitution of the word *zebel* (= 'dung') for the second part of the name. Others suggest *zebul* = 'dwelling', and regard the word as an opprobrious rendering of the Greek *Zeus Ouranios* (= 'Zeus ⟨lord⟩ of heaven') in the sense of 'lord of the ⟨heavenly⟩ Dwelling', with the further suggestion that there is an allusion to this in our Lord's words about spoiling the strong man's 'house', and perhaps also in Mt x 25.

23. *He called them unto him*: it is implied that the remark of the scribes was not addressed to Jesus: Mt and Lk suppose Him to have read their thoughts.

In parables, i. e. 'in half-veiled, proverb-like teaching' (Swete). The semitic *maschal*, variously rendered 'parable' and 'proverb', may mean a comparison, an illustrative story, or it may mean a gnomic saying (cf. Prov i 6).

How can Satan drive out Satan? In the apocryphal 'Enoch' literature we hear of 'satans' in the plural, but the meaning here is not 'How can one satan drive out another?' but 'How can Satan drive out himself?' It is presupposed that there is only one 'Satan', or rather that the demons all obey a single chief.

25. *House* can in Aramaic be used in a broad sense for a political domain.

27. In 'Q' this verse was preceded by the words 'If I by the spirit of God cast out demons, &c.' (Mt xii 28, Lk xi 20), which suggests that the Binder of the Strong is God. Mk suggests rather our Lord as the Binder of Satan.

28. *Verily*: the original has *amen*, a Hebrew expression (= 'so be it') used liturgically and otherwise to conclude a prayer or wish. Its use as an asseveration at the beginning of a sentence, referring to the words which follow, is peculiar to the Gospels and appears to have been characteristic of our Lord.

The sons of men (= men) is an aramaism found here only in the Gospels.

28–29. A comparison with Mt xii 31–32, Lk xii 10 suggests that 'Q' had a *double* saying, not necessarily belonging originally to the present context, in which blasphemy against the Spirit—an unforgivable offence—was contrasted with the speaking of a word against the Son of Man, which might be forgiven. Assuming that the version of 'Q' is nearer to what our Lord actually said, we must suppose that 'Son of Man' in this saying was used simply as the equivalent of the first personal pronoun (for which it may indeed have been substituted in transmission, cf. Mt xvi 13 as against Mk viii 27), and that what our Lord said will have been, in effect: ‘Any other kind of blasphemy or calumny is more pardonable than blasphemy against the Spirit. You are not merely calumniating *Me*—that would be forgivable; but you are calumniating the Holy Spirit, and that is in the literal sense unpardonable.’ By the time that Mk's Gospel was written, to calumniate Christ and to calumniate the Holy Spirit had come to appear (from the standpoint of Christian faith) offences equally heinous and virtually identical. Mk may therefore have deliberately dropped the distinction between them; or alternatively he may have been following the version of our Lord's teaching which was current in Rome (‘Q^R’). Some scholars, however, are disposed to think that *sons of men* in verse 28 may be an inaccurate recollection of ‘Son of Man’, which occurred in the ‘Q’ form of the saying.

29. *Hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin.* The Western Text (D) omits ‘for ever’,[1] and Wellhausen thinks the omission was original; in which case translate ‘hath no forgiveness, but’ &c. The tendency as time went on was to strengthen our Lord's words—so Mt renders *it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come.* But it is clear that our Lord declared that to blaspheme the Holy Spirit by ascribing to Satan what was manifestly a work of God was to be guilty of essential wickedness:[2] it was to be in a state of mind which, so long as it lasted, was essentially unforgivable, and might easily become permanent.

30. A comment added by the Evangelist to show the connexion of our Lord's saying with the context in which he has placed it.

31–35. *Jesus' kinsfolk after the Spirit*

(Cf. Mt xii 46–50; Lk viii 19–21)

31 And there come his mother and his brethren; and, stand-
32 ing without, they sent unto him, calling him. And a multi-
tude was sitting about him; and they say unto him, Behold,
33 thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee. And he
answereth them, and saith, Who is my mother and my
34 brethren? And looking round on them which sat round
about him, he saith, Behold, my mother and my brethren!
35 For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my
brother, and sister, and mother.

---

[1] The authority of D in favour of omitting the words in question is now reinforced by that of the recently discovered MSS. W and Θ.

[2] Or perhaps, ‘in the grip of a perpetual sin’.

The mother and brethren of Jesus now arrive: He is sitting surrounded by a throng of people: they send in a message. That Jesus refused to see them is not stated, and need not be supposed. At the same time He makes it plain, by what He says to the people, that He has Himself 'left house, or brethren, or sisters, or mother . . . for the Gospel's sake' (Mk x 29), that (like S. Paul) He now 'knows no man after the flesh' (2 Cor v 16), and that they who *do the will of God* are the spiritual kinsfolk of the Son of Man.

31. It is commonly supposed that Joseph was by this time dead, but the fact that he does not accompany the party may be accidental. That Mk abstains on dogmatic grounds from mentioning him is less probable, though it is by no means certain that he was unacquainted with the story of the Virgin Birth (see on vi 1–6).

32. *Thy mother and thy brethren.* A number of MSS. add *and thy sisters*, but it is unlikely that the sisters came, and the reading is no doubt the inference of some scribe from verse 35, where, however, the mention of 'sisters' is due to the presence of women in Jesus' audience.

35. The Lord speaks of His spiritual *brother, and sister, and mother*, but not 'father'—a designation which He always reserved for God. With the saying of Jesus as a whole cf. Heb ii 11.

CHAPTER IV

1–2 a. *Jesus teaches in Parables*

(Cf. Mt xiii 1–3 a; Lk viii 4)

1 And again he began to teach by the sea side. And there is gathered unto him a very great multitude, so that he entered into a boat,[1] and sat in the sea; and all the multi-
2 tude were by the sea on the land. And he taught them many things in parables.

---

[1] Read, *the boat.*

The Evangelist resumes the description of a typical scene by the Lake (cf. iii 7–12) in order to provide a setting for a typical group of parables. The crowd is by this time so great that the boat which was got ready in iii 9 is now in use, and our Lord addresses the people from it as from a sort of floating pulpit. The connexion of what follows with the evangelist's *mise-en-scène* is artificial. The parables themselves are strung together by the connecting links *and he said unto them* (verse 21) or *and he said* (verses 26, 30): at the end we have the generalized statement *and with many such parables spake he the word unto them, as they were able to hear it* (verse 33). The probability is that Mk is here drawing upon some already existing collection of our Lord's parables. The process of making such collections will have begun at a very early date. It is pointed out by Streeter that while the 'Q' document appears to have contained at least the Mustard Seed and the Leaven, both Mt and Lk seem to have independent access to two different collections, which overlapped as regards three of the parables which they contained, viz. the Lost Sheep, the Marriage Feast (= the Great Supper), and the Talents (= the Pounds).[1] As a matter of history it is not likely that our Lord's parables were uttered in a continuous series, and the artificiality of the setting in Mk is still further evident from the fact that in verse 10 the Lord is withdrawn into semi-privacy in order to expound the parable of the Sower to a select circle, whereas the parables which follow (at least from verse 26 onwards) are apparently addressed as before to the general multitude, and *when even was come* (verse 35) our Lord is still *in the boat* (verse 36), as at the beginning of the day.

If these conclusions are right, it follows that we do not know the precise context or setting in which our Lord uttered His parables. If we did, it is probable that many things about them which are now obscure or difficult to interpret would become clear. What, in particular, was our Lord's real purpose in teaching by means of parables? Was it, as the words ascribed to Him in verses 11 sqq. would suggest, in order to conceal His true meaning from 'them that were without?' It is difficult to think that this can really have been so. The method of teaching by means of parables was not new. It was a familiar method of the Rabbis.[2] And the purpose of a parable is to explain; it is not intended itself to require explanation. A parable is not a detailed allegory, or meant to be mysterious. It is a short illustrative story intended to enforce a specific point. In their original context it is probable that our Lord's parables were clear and intelligible enough. It was after the original context of a parable, and with it in many cases the point which the parable was originally intended to enforce, had alike been forgotten, that a time came when explanation was felt to be required. For the parables were now found difficult: it was assumed that our Lord must have meant them to be so. It was assumed that they were intended to conceal from the majority, and yet to reveal to the few (who possessed —or who had given to them—the clue) a hidden wisdom. Cf. however Mt xi 25 (= Lk x 21).

The result was that what were originally parables, intended to illustrate, were transformed into allegories, which needed a clue: a change of attitude towards the parables which was rendered all the easier by the fact that the word for 'parable' in the original Aramaic, like the word *maschal* in Hebrew, could easily bear the new meaning.[1] In one or two cases an authoritative explanation of the parables (now understood as allegories) came to be provided: the Gospels preserve such 'explanations' in the case of the Sower (Mk iv 10–20) and the Tares (Mt xiii 36–43). It seems probable that these more or less allegorical interpretations do not, as a matter of actual history, go back to our Lord Himself, but are examples of early Christian exegesis. They were put forth, more or less authoritatively, as *the* explanation of what the parables meant, and the belief arose that the Lord had so explained them privately to the disciples. (Of course it is *possible* that in one or two cases the disciples were puzzled by something in a parable and asked our Lord to explain it, but it is equally possible that the whole conception of the parables as being difficult is of later growth.) In Mk iv 10–12, 33–34 this theory is developed further and applied to the parables of our Lord in general. They conveyed *the 'mystery' of the Kingdom of God* (Lk viii 10 has the plural '*mysteries*')[2] which only the initiated were intended to understand. The general mass of the people was not *intended* to repent. Here, again, it is *possible* that our Lord at some time may have 'reflected on His failure to convert His people', and 'may have felt that His mission to Israel was strangely similar to that of Isaiah (see Is vi 9 sqq.)' (H. G. Wood). But in view of the similar arguments based on O.T. prophecies in S. Paul (Rom ix 18–29, x 16–21, xi 8–10; cf. also Acts xxviii 25 sqq.) it seems more likely that what we have in Mk is not an historically accurate statement of our Lord's purpose in teaching by means of parables, but rather a theory which was a product of early Christian reflection upon the actual results of the preaching of Christianity among the Jews. Actually the Jewish nation, taken as a whole, did fail to understand, and had rejected Christianity. The mind of the early Christian Church explained this as being due to a judicial hardening of their hearts which was itself part and parcel of the divine purpose.[3]

---

[1] Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 243 sqq.

[2] Examples of rabbinical parables—one or two of them closely parallel to parables ascribed to our Lord—are quoted by Oesterley and Box (*Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp. 98–100). See also Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* i, pp. 90 sqq.

To say all this is not, of course, to deny that our Lord by His parables intended to stimulate and to challenge thought. So much is certainly implied by the repeated and enigmatic *Who hath ears to hear, let him hear* (Mk iv 9, cf. iv 23) and the warning *Take heed what*

---

[1] 'The Semitic terms *maschal*, *mathla* do not differentiate between "comparison", "proverb", "parable" and "allegory"; even *chida* ("riddle") could be included under the same extremely wide and loosely defined idea' (Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci*, p. 29).

[2] Not Mt xiii 11, according to the true reading (cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 313).

[3] The above theory of the parables is substantially that of Jülicher, as set forth in his standard work, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (2 vols., 1899). Like many of his countrymen Jülicher states his thesis in a hard and exclusive way, and perhaps presses the distinction between parable and allegory with excessive 'vigour and rigour'. The book was critically reviewed by Sanday in the *J. Th. S.* for Jan. 1900. But it does not seem to me that Jülicher's main position has been shaken by Dr. Sanday's criticism.

(or more probably *how*)[1] *ye hear* (Mk iv 24). Our Lord was giving people something to think about, and was making an appeal to spiritual discernment. But this is quite a different thing from teaching esoterically, or with the deliberate intention of being misunderstood.

2 b–9. *The Parable of the Sower*

(Cf. Mt xiii 3 b–9 ; Lk viii 5–8)

2 b, 3 And (he) said unto them in his teaching, Hearken : Be-
4 hold, the sower went forth to sow : and it came to pass, as
he sowed, some *seed* fell by the way side, and the birds
5 came and devoured it. And other fell on the rocky *ground*,
where it had not much earth ; and straightway it sprang up,
6 because it had no deepness of earth : and when the sun was
risen, it was scorched ; and because it had no root, it withered
7 away. And other fell among the thorns, and the thorns
8 grew up, and choked it, and it yielded no fruit. And others
fell into the good ground, and yielded fruit, growing up
and increasing ; and brought forth, thirtyfold, and sixtyfold,
9 and a hundredfold. And he said, Who hath ears to hear,
let him hear.

Loisy remarks that the initial *Hearken* or 'Listen !' has a special significance for Mk and is related to the conclusion—*Who hath ears to hear, let him hear!* Both correspond to the idea which the Evangelist has of the parables as mysterious, and requiring special attention, goodwill, and intelligence for their comprehension. If primitive, the opening apostrophe will be in the mouth of our Lord a simple appeal for attention. The parable itself requires little comment. *The sower* need not be taken allegorically as referring to our Lord : he is simply the man whose business it is to sow seed, and the parable describes what happens to the seed he sows. A trodden path runs across the field, and some seed falls on the path. In places there is rock thinly coated with soil and here and there cropping up through the earth, as often in Galilaean cornlands to this day. The *thorns* are the result of bad husbandry : the oriental farmer will not be at the pains to eradicate them : they have been cut down or burnt, but the roots are still in the soil and spring up afresh, impeding the development of the wheat. The enormous yield of such seed as does not come to grief in one or other of the three ways indicated is described with a touch of oriental extravagance of language.

---

[1] So Lk understands the saying (cf. Lk viii 18).

'The parable gives us under a thin disguise the experience of Jesus as a preacher' (Menzies).[1] It is, in fact, the experience of every preacher and teacher that there are discouragements, and that much labour seems to be merely thrown away. The main point is that there is enough success assured to make the work abundantly worth while, and in this sense the parable was adapted to encourage the missionaries of Christianity in Apostolic days in the face of apparent failure. The parable, then, is not about the Kingdom of God, but about preaching—or, perhaps, in its original application as uttered by our Lord, about the responsibility of listening. To S. Mk's mind the parable may have served to illustrate the contrast between responsive hearers (i. e. the disciples) and unresponsive hearers (i. e. the Jews)—(B. W. Bacon).

Loisy suggests that the Sower comes first in the Gospels, not only because tradition associated it with an explanation of the purpose of parables, but because it is the parable of the Word, and has a universal character, which marked it out as the typical parable ; and that it probably formed the first, and the Wicked Husbandmen the last, of the earliest collection of our Lord's parables. Both of these parables (and they only) occur in all three of the Synoptic Gospels.

9. *Who hath ears to hear, let him hear*: Cf. iv 23, Mt xi 15 and xiii 9 (=Mk iv 9), Lk xiv 35, Apoc ii 7, 11, 17, 29, iii 6, 13, 22, xiii 9. The saying in its various forms is always, wherever it occurs, (except Apoc xiii 9) an utterance of Christ.

10–12. *The Christian 'Mystery'*

(Cf. Mt xiii 10–13 ; Lk viii 9–10)

10 And when he was alone, they that were about him with the
11 twelve asked of him the parables. And he said unto them,
Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God:
but unto them that are without, all things are done in
12 parables: that seeing they may see, and not perceive; and
hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they
should turn again, and it should be forgiven them.

Verse 12: cf. Is vi 9 sq.

Instead of *asked of him the parables* we expect the singular—'asked him about *the parable*': the Western Text has *asked him what this parable was*, which looks like a correction. But the natural answer to the disciples' question is in verse 13. Wellhausen thinks that verses 11–12 are an interpolation. If we reject the theory of an *Urmarcus* (i. e. an original Mark which was subsequently 'edited' with interpolations), this suggestion falls to the ground; but the Evangelist himself may well have combined a theory of the 'mysterious' character of parables, which came to him from current Church tradition, with a context to which it was originally foreign. In this sense these verses will be patchwork, and the awkward wording of verse 10 (translate, 'they asked him for the parables' or 'about the parables') is no doubt designed to admit of the general theory about parables in verses 11–12 appearing to be equally an answer to the disciples' question with the explanation of the parable of the Sower in verses 13 sqq. The general theory of parables here put forward has been already discussed (see above). The contrast which is emphasized between the Lord's immediate circle and 'those without' is no doubt meant by the Evangelist as a prophetic foreshadowing of the eventual breach between Christianity and Judaism.

---

[1] From which it follows, as my friend Dr. Easton of the General Theological Seminary in New York has pointed out to me, that the parable should be referred to a relatively late stage in our Lord's ministry.

Loisy remarks on the use here made of Is vi 9–10 that 'the language of the Old and even of the New Testament does not as a rule distinguish, in the matter of God's providential decrees, between what is directly willed and what is merely permitted. From the "absolute" point of view of Semitic theology, all that God foreknows and regulates in advance is regarded as equally willed: it all appears "necessary". The biblical writers, however, do not adopt this idea as a philosophical dogma, the logical consequence of which would of course be the denial of human freedom. They do not regard Israel as being in some unique sense the victim of fate, or consider the sin of Israel as though it were not to be set down to the account of Israel's evil will; the blindness and reprobation of Israel, foretold centuries beforehand, happen as though by a kind of divine necessity, which yet does not destroy her responsibility. In the present case, it is the idea of providential necessity, not that of human responsibility, which supplies Christian apologetics with the answer which it needed in order to meet the difficulty suggested by the failure of the Gospel to convert the Jews.'[1]

Apart from this passage and its parallels the term *mystery* is used elsewhere in the N.T. only in the Pauline epistles and in the Apocalypse. It is presumably borrowed by Mk from the language of Apocalyptic theology, because he regards the parables as revelations hidden under symbolic forms. The word had been used in the LXX translation of Daniel to denote the 'secrets' which are revealed by God to Daniel. In the earlier books of the LXX the translators seem to have avoided it, perhaps because of its pagan associations. It is used freely, however, in the later apocryphal books of the Gk. O.T., in one or two cases specifically to denote the heathen 'mysteries' (so Wisdom xiv 15, 23). The term could not fail to suggest this analogy to Gentile readers. They would understand it as meaning that Christianity, too, was a 'Mystery' Religion, disclosing to men a great Secret of God, a saving 'mystery' which in its completeness was revealed only to the initiated. In Mk it is still the 'mystery' of the Kingdom of God: in 1 Tim iii 16 it has become the 'mystery' of 'godliness', i. e. of Christianity in general.

---

[1] *Les Evangiles Synoptiques* i, pp. 740–741.

13–20. *A commentary on the Parable of the Sower*

(Cf. Mt xiii 18–23; Lk viii 11–15).

13 And he saith unto them, Know ye not this parable? and
14 how shall ye know all the parables? The sower soweth the
15 word. And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; and when they have heard, straightway cometh Satan, and taketh away the word which hath been sown in
16 them. And these in like manner are they that are sown upon the rocky *places*, who, when they have heard the word,
17 straightway receive it with joy; and they have no root in themselves, but endure for a while; then, when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, straightway they
18 stumble. And others are they that are sown among the
19 thorns; these are they that have heard the word, and the cares of the world,[1] and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it
20 becometh unfruitful. And those are they that were sown upon the good ground; such as hear the word, and accept it, and bear fruit, thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold.

[1] Or, *age.*

In this exposition the parable, itself originally a sermon, has become rather a theme for sermons, in which the centre of interest is no longer in the Sower, but in the different kinds of soil. There is, as W. C. Allen remarks, 'a curious Semitic lack of precision in the explanation of the details'. *The sower*, we are told, *soweth*, not seed, but *the word*: then in verses 15, 16, 18, 20 the different seeds, which fall in different places, are allegorized as different sorts of men, though strictly the differences in the results of the sowing are not due to anything in the seeds, but to differences of soil. It is difficult not to think that what is here presented to us is rather the way in which the parable was currently applied when Mk was written than any authentic word of Jesus. The 'sower' is in no specific sense our Lord: he is any preacher of the Gospel. The 'word' is the Gospel message (cf. 1 Thess ii 13) which finds four classes of hearers. Satan, the great 'hinderer' of mission work (cf. 1 Thess ii 18), ever on the alert, succeeds in some cases in preventing the message from finding even an initial acceptance. In another class of cases the word is joyfully received (cf. 1 Thess i 5–9, ii 13), but when *tribulation or persecution* breaks out *because of the word*, the converts lapse, as S. Paul feared might happen at Thessalonica (1 Thess iii 3 sqq.). In neither of these cases do the hearers become permanent members of the Christian community. The third case typifies 'Christians of the kind attacked in the Epistle of S. James, worldly men, who indeed receive the word and become believers, but whose faith remains unfruitful—as S. James would say "not having works" (Jas ii 17, 20, 26). The luxuriant weeds of the parable are strikingly compared to the "cares" which are the result of attachment to this present "world". They leave no room in the soul for the development of the word; faith conjoined with absorbing anxiety cannot thrive. Besides this, there is *the deceitfulness of riches*. That Mammon (cf. Lk xvi 9) is deceitful, an apparent and not a real good, is a truth which wise men in every age have recognized, and which was particularly emphasized by the philosophers of early Imperial times at Rome. Mk's Roman readers understand the compressed phrase, which recalls to them what they have often heard before. *Lusts of other things* is a veiled way of saying sensuality in its various forms (cf. 1 Jn ii 16). Where pleasures of sense and desire of riches occupy the soul, so delicate a plant as that of faith cannot possibly develop: it is overgrown and choked, and bears no fruit. And yet for all this a preacher of the word does experience the same joy as the husbandman: he does always find among his hearers some who not only hear and receive the word but also *bear fruit*, in different degrees of course and in varying abundance (the interpreter here simply takes over the figures from the parable)—but still they do bear fruit. The preacher must think of them, and, for the sake of such success, put up with inevitable disappointments in other cases.' (J. Weiss.)

13. Our Lord is here represented as being surprised at the disciples' lack of insight. The parables are not really so obscure as they pretend!

17. *Endure for a while*: the Gk. word here used is a rare one. Allen renders *they are ephemeral*: Wellhausen at one time suggested 'capricious as the weather', 'changing with a change of season'. *They stumble*: the Gk. verb so translated is formed from the substantive which gives us our English word 'scandal': originally and properly the word in question should mean 'snare' rather than 'stumbling-block', but in three passages in the LXX it is used to translate a Hebrew word which has this latter meaning, viz. Lev xix 14, 1 Sam xxv 31, Ps cxix 165, and in the N.T. it is usually

so rendered. W. C. Allen in a lengthy note argues in favour of the translation 'snare' for the substantive and 'ensnare' for the verb, wherever they occur in the N.T.; but the resulting renderings frequently appear strained and pedantic. B. W. Bacon remarks that the word when Mk wrote had already become in Christian circles 'a technical term for backsliding as well as unbelief (cf. Rom ix 32, 33, xi 9; 1 Cor i 23)'.

21–25. *A catena of short sayings*

(Cf. Lk viii 16–18; also Mt v 15; Lk xi 33; Mt x 26; Lk xi 2; Mt vii 2; Lk vi 38; Mt xiii 12; Mt xxv 29; Lk xix 26)

21 And he said unto them, Is the lamp brought to be put
under the bushel, or under the bed, *and* not to be put on the
22 stand? For there is nothing hid, save that it should be
manifested; neither was *anything* made secret, but that it
23 should come to light. If any man hath ears to hear, let him
24 hear. And he said unto them, Take heed what ye hear:
with what measure ye mete it shall be measured unto you:
25 and more shall be given unto you. For he that hath, to
him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall
be taken away even that which he hath.

The sayings collected in this paragraph occur scattered in various contexts in Mt and Lk, though Lk also reproduces them *en bloc* in the parallel passage corresponding to this of Mk. They were probably therefore contained in 'Q': Mk may either have derived them from 'Q^R' or from general Church tradition. As they now stand in the Gospels the sayings bear different meanings in different Evangelists, according to the differing contexts in which they are placed. Their original meaning and context is no longer recoverable: the most that can be said is that verse 25 seems to have had its original place in the Parable of the Talents (Mt xxv 29 = Lk xix 26), and that the Matthaean contexts seem generally more appropriate than the Marcan.

As understood by Mk verses 21, 22 appear to mean that although for the present the truth is concealed from the multitudes and communicated to the disciples as a hidden mystery, this policy is only for a time, and manifestation, not concealment, is the ultimate end in view. Just as it is the *raison d'être* of a lamp to give light, so it is the *raison d'être* of truth to be revealed. The repetition of *if any man hath ears to hear, let him hear* from verse 9 serves, as it were, to underline the above remark and to suggest that it contains an important truth, needful for the times in which Mk is writing: the time has now come to abandon the policy of reserve, and to declare the Gospel plainly before men!

The second pair of sayings in Mk is even more obscure and difficult than the first. *Take heed what ye hear* may mean 'Pay attention to what you hear', or it may be correctly glossed by Lk ('Take heed *how* ye hear', Lk viii 18). The words are apparently meant to emphasize the responsibility of the disciples as at once the recipients and the dispensers of spiritual truth. If they are to hand on the revelation to others they must be ready to receive it themselves. Lagrange thinks that 'You will be served according to the measure you employ' is a popular proverb, and that it here means that divine truth will be communicated to the disciples in whatever 'measure' they show themselves able and willing to receive it, i. e. to the full extent of their capacity: nay, even beyond their capacity, for God[1] will give them more! The second saying may be also a popular proverb, coined perhaps by some cynical observer of oriental society, who had noticed how presents were given to rich men, while the poor man, who had nothing, was fleeced to the last farthing. As here applied it means that in spiritual things he who receives and makes his own that which is first given to him will receive a yet richer gift, whereas he who through carelessness and inattention fails to do so will lose it—and more. A more usual view is that the first of the two proverbs means that the disciples will receive from God in proportion to the measure of their spiritual largess to others.

21. *Is the lamp brought . . .?* The Gk. has 'Does the lamp *come*?' —a difficult phrase presumably meaning 'Is the lamp got ready?' The Western Text reads, 'Is the lamp lighted?' *Bushel*: the Gk. word here is a transliteration of the Latin *modius* ('a peck measure').

26–29. *The Parable of the Fruit-bearing Earth*

26 And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should
27 cast seed upon the earth; and should sleep and rise night
and day, and the seed should spring up and grow, he
28 knoweth not how. The earth beareth[1] fruit of herself;
first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.
29 But when the fruit is ripe,[2] straightway he putteth forth[3]
the sickle, because the harvest is come.

[1] Or, *yieldeth*. [2] Or, *alloweth*. [3] Or, *sendeth forth*.

This parable is unique in being peculiar to Mk and it is arbitrary to see in it only a Marcan extract from the parable of the Tares (Mt xiii 24 sqq.). In default of a context it is extremely difficult to interpret. The central thought seems to be that of the inscrutability of the process by which, the seed once sown, the harvest develops without further intervention on the part of man. But what is the application of this idea to the Kingdom of God? Is it that the Kingdom, when it arrives, will be wholly the work of God, a divine gift, not a human achievement, and that the process by which God establishes His Kingdom eludes man's observation? Or is it that the work of our Lord in Galilee, and His proclamation of the Kingdom's near approach, is comparable to sowing? Is the parable meant to teach that if, as the result of this 'sowing', nothing obvious appears to happen—if there is a kind of pause before the *dénouement* of the drama—this is only what is to be expected: the harvest is none the less assured? Many commentators discover in verse 28 the idea of growth and gradualness, and regarding this as the main idea of the parable, think that our Lord here means to teach that the coming of the Kingdom is a gradual or even an age-long process, a slow development, such as would harmonize with the favourite modern idea of evolution. I cannot persuade myself that this is anything more than a modern construction of the parable; it introduces a conception of the Kingdom which was certainly foreign to the outlook alike of Judaism and of early Christianity, it is at least difficult to harmonize with the main emphasis of the recorded teaching of our Lord about the Kingdom, and I cannot but think that it is false to the historical mind of Christ. J. Weiss, who points out that the connexion of this parable with the general theme of the Kingdom of God is only a vague one (the somewhat stereotyped opening words need mean no more than that this parable was included in an early collection of parables generally understood to refer in some way to the Kingdom), thinks that the main thought is that of the sower, and of what he can and cannot do. As the husbandman sows and then waits, so Jesus can only fulfil His mission of preaching, making disciples, and preparing the way. He cannot compel the arrival of the Kingdom of God, any more than the husbandman can compel the harvest. Many of His adherents probably sought to induce Him to take violent action: He speaks elsewhere about men of violence, who sought to take the Kingdom of Heaven by storm (Mt xi 12). What He says here about the limitations of His mission and of His powers may be directed against such tendencies (cf. the later Zealot movement). We are to learn from this, as from all the 'Kingdom' parables, that our Lord regards the *dénouement* of the Kingdom as in no sense the work of man—nay, not even as His own work—but as the work of God. All that man can do is to prepare and make ready for the great Event.

---

[1] 'Sometimes the passive voice of the verb is preferred, on the ground that, if an active voice were used, it would be necessary to name God as the subject' (Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, E.T., p. 224). Late Judaism avoided the use of the Divine Name from motives of reverence.

In the last words of the parable there is more than a touch of allegory, since they echo the language of Joel iii 13 and appear to allude more or less plainly to the Judgement. Some critics therefore regard them as a later addition to the parable in the allegorizing vein of the early Church. But they appear integral to the context—some reference to the harvest is surely essential: and even though the broad distinction between parable and allegory holds good, it seems pedantic to exclude with absolute rigidity an occasional allegorical reference from the genuine parables of our Lord.

The parable in its context in the Gospel is of course meant to be understood not only with reference to the historical circumstances of our Lord's life, but as applying also to the contemporary Church. The 'patient husbandman' is a type of the Christian missionary, who, when he has sown in faith the seed of the divine word, must leave it to God to give the increase and to bring the harvest in His time.

28. *The earth beareth fruit of herself*: Gr. 'automatically'. The modern idea of a 'law of Nature' conceived as working itself out by a kind of inner necessity *apart from God* is of course foreign to the thought of Jesus, as to all Christian thought. For Him as for us the 'spontaneous' growth of the seed is the work of God.

29. *When the fruit is ripe*: read with R.V. mg. 'allows' or 'permits'. But the phrase is difficult. Blass and C. H. Turner have both independently suggested an emendation which would have the effect of substituting 'time' for 'fruit': in which case translate 'when the time' (i. e. harvest time) 'allows'.

30–32. *The Parable of the Mustard Seed*

(Cf. Mt xiii 31–32; Lk xiii 18–19)

30 And he said, How shall we liken the kingdom of God? or
31 in what parable shall we set it forth? It is like[1] a grain
of mustard seed, which, when it is sown upon the earth,
though it be less than all the seeds that are upon the earth,
32 yet when it is sown, groweth up, and becometh greater
than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches; so that
the birds of the heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof.

---

[1] Gr. *As unto.*

'Small as a grain of mustard seed' appears to have been a Jewish proverb (cf. Mt xvii 20, Lk xvii 6). The plant shoots up with great rapidity, and becomes one of the tallest among garden 'herbs'—it is said that in Palestine mustard plants will sometimes grow to the height of 6 ft. or more; its 'branches' indeed are hardly analogous to those of a 'tree': but it is a considerable plant, *under the shadow* of which a bird might take shelter, though hardly build a nest. It is probable that this parable at least of Mk's triad stood also in 'Q', and that 'Q' read 'garden' (Lk xiii 19) and 'tree' (Mt xiii 32, Lk xiii 19). Mk's version has (more appropriately) *greater than all the herbs* (i. e. than all the *other* herbs), thus avoiding the hyperbolical description of the mustard plant as a 'tree'. Jülicher and others think that in ‘Q’ the Mustard Seed formed a companion parable to that of the Leaven (Mt xiii 33, Lk xiii 20–21).

The comparison does not turn here, any more than in the case of the parable last considered, upon the idea of gradual growth or of development, which the quick-growing mustard would be ill-adapted to symbolize. The point lies rather in the contrast between the almost imperceptible seed and the surprisingly large plant. If the idea of the time occupied enters into the comparison at all (which is doubtful), it can only be in the sense that the fact of the whole process taking place within (at the most) a few weeks serves to heighten the marvel. The lesson of the parable will be that the apparently insignificant results of Jesus’ preaching are no measure by which to judge the greatness of the Kingdom of God which He proclaims.

As applied to the circumstances of the Evangelist’s own time, the meaning will be that the insignificant beginnings of Christian missions must not daunt the missionary’s faith. The bringing in of the Kingdom is God’s affair, and His victory is assured, and that soon. It is possible, further, that the Evangelist means the reference to *the birds of the heaven* in verse 32 to be interpreted allegorically in the light of such passages as Ezek xvii 22 sqq., Dan iv 10 sqq., 21; in which case we are to think of the expansion of the Gospel as a bringing of all nations within the scope of the Divine Kingdom.

30. The opening question has the poetical form of Jewish parallelism. Allen compares ‘the usual opening of a parable in the second-century and later Jewish literature, “A parable. To what is the matter like? To”, &c.’

33–34. *Concluding remark on the use of Parables*

(Cf. Mt xiii 34–35)

33 And with many such parables spake he the word unto
34 them, as they were able to hear it: and without a parable
spake he not unto them: but privately to his own disciples
he expounded all things.

It is implied that Mk knew of a larger collection of our Lord’s parables than those which he has given. It is significant of the Evangelist’s missionary interest that the three which he actually quotes all refer to the operation of *sowing* in its various aspects: in all three he is able to see an allusion to the work of mission preaching as a sowing of the seed of the ‘word’, a scattering broadcast of the Gospel message.

Commentators point out that verse 33 gives expression to what was probably our Lord’s true purpose in teaching by means of parables, viz. to help people to understand by expressing his message in a pictorial form adapted to the capacity of their minds: verse 34 somewhat inconsistently combines with this the 'esoteric' theory of the parables.

35–41. *The stilling of the storm*

(Cf. Mt viii 23–27; Lk viii 22–25)

35 And on that day, when even was come, he saith unto them,
36 Let us go over unto the other side. And leaving the multi-
tude, they take him with them, even as he was, in the boat.
37 And other boats were with him. And there ariseth a great
storm of wind, and the waves beat into the boat, insomuch
38 that the boat was now filling. And he himself was in the
stern, asleep on the cushion: and they awake him, and say
39 unto him, Master,[1] carest thou not that we perish? And
he awoke, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea,
Peace, be still. And the wind ceased, and there was a great
40 calm. And he said unto them, Why are ye fearful? have
41 ye not yet faith? And they feared exceedingly, and said
one to another, Who then is this, that even the wind and
the sea obey him?

---

[1] Or, *Teacher*.

H. G. Wood and J. Weiss group this story with the narratives in Chap. V under the general heading 'Wonder-Stories', and Bacon similarly in his analysis of the Gospel links together the same group of stories under the heading 'Manifestation ⟨of Jesus⟩ in Mighty Works'. The two editors last mentioned both notice further that it is implied that the 'mighty works' were of no avail against Jewish unbelief (cf. vi 1–6 a). We have had miracle-stories already in this Gospel: the Evangelist has no qualms about them, such as modern people experience. In particular, the modern tendency to discriminate between 'nature miracles' and cases of faith-healing and exorcism, to find scientific analogies to the latter, but to regard the former as frankly impossible, is wholly foreign to the standpoint of antiquity. For the Evangelist all are equally miraculous and all are equally possible: Who shall set limits to the power of God? The miracles in Mk's view are of high evidential value, as being a manifestation of the divine nature of the Son of God in works of power. To rationalize such stories by treating them as popular exaggerations of 'natural' events is to miss the point of their purpose. In Mk's narrative they are quite naïvely told, and their colouring is indubitably 'popular'—cf. the treatment of the storm as a kind of demon (iv 39, see below), the naïve character of the demonology in the Gadarene story, especially the belief in the transference of the demons to the swine (v 11 sqq.), and the conception of supernatural power as proceeding from Jesus' person without the concurrence of His will (v 30, vi 56, cf. iii 10). Mk, moreover, is writing from thirty to forty years after the events in question, and the stories no doubt had been told and retold in the interval times without number. Their precise historical basis, whatever it may have been, is now irrecoverable. It has often been argued that the intense vividness and realism of the stories as Mk narrates them is a reflection of the unforgettably vivid impression made by the events on some eyewitness—not, of course, on the Evangelist, since tradition is clear that Mk was not personally an eyewitness of our Lord's ministry,[1] but on some one or other of his informants. There is no doubt that his narrative smacks of the soil of Palestine and reflects the popular mind of Galilee; and the Evangelist had been closely associated with the Apostolic company at Jerusalem, and in all likelihood subsequently for a time with S. Peter at Rome: he was therefore in a position to gather narratives at first hand. It is obvious, however, that arguments of this hypothetical and impressionistic type are, at best, precarious. On the other hand, it is not the case that it was *inevitable* that miracle-stories should attach themselves to the tradition of *any* great religious personality who became a popular hero in the Palestine of our Lord's day: we have the negative instance of John the Baptist (cf. Jn x 41). Nor is it clear that there was any antecedent expectation among the Jews that the Messiah in particular would be a wonder-worker, unless we are to infer this by implication from S. Paul's expectation of the 'lying wonders' to be wrought by Antichrist (2 Thess ii 9, cf. Mk xiii 22).[2] It was part of the impression made by Jesus upon His contemporaries that His contemporaries and close associates believed Him to have worked miracles. Behind this fact it is not as a rule possible, on purely historical grounds, to go. The broad truth of the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation once assumed, no wise person will proceed rashly to draw the limits between what is and what is not possible; in particular instances it must be left to the individual reader of the Gospel to judge of the historical probabilities for himself. The truth of Christianity in any case does not stand or fall with the historical accuracy in detail of the miracle-stories in the Gospels. For further remarks upon the general subject of miracles see Introduction, pp. xlvi sqq.

Mk connects the stilling of the storm with the teaching in parables by supposing that our Lord, just *as He was, in the boat,* instead of disembarking when evening came, proposed to the disciples that they should cross the Lake forthwith. There is nothing to indicate what the purpose of this may have been—whether to evade the crowds, or with a view to proclaiming the Good News elsewhere, i. e. on the farther shore of the Lake. Mt and Lk, perhaps rightly, both disregard the Marcan connexion as artificial. The statement that the boat which contained our Lord and His disciples was accompanied by *other boats* (which presumably were lost or were forced by the storm to put back?) appears so motiveless that it has been thought that it can only be explained as due to historical reminiscence of the facts. The narrative seems to imply that it is now late in the evening: the Lord sleeps after the labours of the day, His head propped against a cushion in the stern. Many travellers have described the suddenness with which on the Lake of Galilee a violent squall will sometimes lash the waters to fury and as suddenly subside. Loisy quotes a description from Mgr. le Camus: 'It is not unusual to see terrible squalls hurl themselves, even when the sky is perfectly clear, upon these waters which are ordinarily so calm. The numerous ravines which to the NE. and E. debouch upon the upper part of the Lake operate as so many dangerous defiles in which the winds from the heights of Hauran, the plateaux of Trachonitis, and the summit of Mt. Hermon are caught and compressed in such a way that, rushing with tremendous force through a narrow space and then being suddenly released, they agitate the little Lake of Gennesaret in the most frightful fashion.'[1]

---

[1] Introduction, pp. xvi, xxvi.

[2] Cf., however, Jn vii 31, and see Lukyn Williams, *The Hebrew-Christian Messiah*, pp. 105 sqq.

The disciples, genuinely alarmed, awake their Master, and, perhaps with a touch of irritation that He could go on sleeping in such circumstances (Mt and Lk both soften this down), apprise Him of the peril. He rebukes the wind, and the storm is stilled. The Lord turns to His companions and expresses His astonishment at their lack of faith in God. The disciples are thereupon filled with a new kind of terror as of men in the presence of the supernatural. The uncanny calm and the strange power of Jesus frighten them. They ask one another *Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey Him?* The words express the trouble and perplexity of men who thought they knew their Master, and now find that they did not know Him as they supposed.

38. *Cushion*: the Gk. word implies a cushion for the head. Lagrange remarks that 'in these boats, which will no doubt always have been the same, the place for any distinguished stranger is on the little seat placed at the stern, where a carpet and cushions are arranged. The helmsman stands a little farther forward on the deck, though near the stern, in order to have a better look-out ahead.'

Master: see R.V. mg. The word is no doubt meant as a translation of 'Rabbi'.

39. *Rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still.* The last words mean, literally translated, 'Silence! Be muzzled!' The word *rebuked*, and the command *Be muzzled*, occur in the description of the exorcism in i 25. The Evangelist apparently thought of our

---

[1] Le Camus, *Vie de N.-S. Jésus-Christ* i, p. 427.

Lord's words as being addressed to the demon of the storm. Some critics have suggested the omission of *unto the sea* in this verse, which they think may have arisen by assimilation from verse 41.

40. 'Why are ye so cowardly?' The Lord is surprised that they do not share His own 'faith', i. e. in God. For *have ye not yet faith?* a variant reading has *Why have ye not faith?* But R.V. text and rendering are probably right.

CHAPTER V

1–20. *The Legion of demons*

(Cf. Mt viii 28–34; Lk viii 26–39)

1 And they came to the other side of the sea, into the country
2 of the Gerasenes. And when he was come out of the boat,
straightway there met him out of the tombs a man with an
3 unclean spirit, who had his dwelling in the tombs: and no
4 man could any more bind him, no, not with a chain; because
that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and
the chains had been rent asunder by him, and the fetters
broken in pieces: and no man had strength to tame him.
5 And always, night and day, in the tombs and in the mountains, he was crying out, and cutting himself with stones.
6 And when he saw Jesus from afar, he ran and worshipped
7 him; and crying out with a loud voice, he saith, What have
I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God?
8 I adjure thee by God, torment me not. For he said unto
9 him, Come forth, thou unclean spirit, out of the man. And
he asked him, What is thy name? And he saith unto him,
10 My name is Legion; for we are many. And he besought
him much that he would not send them away out of the
11 country. Now there was there on the mountain side a great
12 herd of swine feeding. And they besought him, saying,
13 Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. And
he gave them leave. And the unclean spirits came out, and
entered into the swine: and the herd rushed down the steep
into the sea, *in number* about two thousand; and they were
14 choked in the sea. And they that fed them fled, and told
it in the city, and in the country. And they came to see

15 what it was that had come to pass. And they come to
Jesus, and behold him that was possessed with devils[1]
sitting, clothed and in his right mind, *even* him that had
16 the legion: and they were afraid. And they that saw it
declared unto them how it befell him that was possessed with
17 devils,[1] and concerning the swine. And they began to
18 beseech him to depart from their borders. And as he was
entering into the boat, he that had been possessed with
19 devils[2] besought him that he might be with him. And he
suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go to thy house unto
thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath
20 done for thee, and *how* he had mercy on thee. And he
went his way, and began to publish in Decapolis how great
things Jesus had done for him: and all men did marvel.

[1] Or, *the demoniac.*

[2] Gr. *demons.*

The description of the demoniac of Gerasa or Gadara (see below) presents a vivid picture of delusional insanity, though the story is, of course, told from the standpoint of the contemporary belief in demons. The demoniac himself shares this hypothesis, and believes himself to be possessed not by an individual demon, but by a 'legion' of demons. A 'legion' was a Roman military unit, a 'regiment' of heavy-armed foot-soldiers, 6,000 strong. The Latin word is used by Mk in a transliterated Greek form. It does not follow that we are to think precisely of 6,000 demons; it is more in the spirit of the narrative to suppose that there were about 2,000, one for each of the swine! The idea that the unclean beasts and the unclean demons were spiritually akin has occurred to commentators, and may have occurred to Mk. The demoniac, catching sight of Jesus in the distance, runs up to Him and does obeisance (verse 6), then, screaming out, addresses Him by name as *Jesus*, entitles Him *Son of the Most High God* (see below), and adjures Him by God not to *torment* him. Mt, who has *torment us before the time* (i. e. before the final Judgement), and Lk, who represents the demons as pleading subsequently that they may not be sent *into the abyss* (i. e. into the nether pit), appear to understand the reference to 'torment' as meaning that the demons were afraid of being prematurely condemned to the 'torment' which was no doubt to be their ultimate fate. This does not seem to be implied in Mk. The utterance of the demoniac, though it stands first in the narrative, is really to be explained by the verse which follows (verse 8). Our Lord has already begun the work of exorcism—*Come forth, thou unclean spirit, out of the man.* The demoniac replies on behalf of the demons, or as their spokesman (so also verse 10, and certainly in verse 9, where the first person plural is used). The dreaded *torment*, then, is apparently the painful paroxysm which attends the expulsion of demons (cf. i 26, ix 26), a paroxysm which may be supposed to hurt them as much as it hurts their victims. The Lord asks, *What is thy name?* In popular belief the knowledge of its name was useful in driving out a spirit, as giving one power over it. 'So too it was in harmony with popular beliefs to conceive of demons as herding together and taking up their abode in a man's body in a troop. A demon moreover does not willingly give its name, and perhaps here avoids doing so, giving its number instead' (Wellhausen). The demons are next represented as parleying with our Lord, admitting defeat, but seeking to capitulate on terms. They consent to change their present abode, but are anxious not to be banished from the country, and ask permission to enter a neighbouring herd of swine. 'In the sequel the demons, despite the fulfilment of their wish and indeed because of it, find themselves cheated of their lodging, and may look for a resting-place (cf. Lk xi 24). This is told with a certain gusto' (Wellhausen). The demons, so to say, are hoist with their own petard. 'Critics who trace a historical nucleus to the story generally assume that at this point the maniac took the disposal of the unwelcome tenants of his personality literally into his own hands by driving the swine into the water' (B. W. Bacon). Loisy remarks that the presence of the swine is intelligible in a half-heathen country: it is probable that neither the owners nor the keepers of the swine were Jews. The effect of what has occurred, when it becomes known, is that the people of the district (not specifically the owners of the swine resenting their loss) become seized with superstitious terror and beseech our Lord to go away. In the existing temper of the inhabitants no useful purpose would be served by remaining, and the Lord complies. The demoniac, now restored to sanity, wishes to accompany his Benefactor, but is enjoined rather (contrast the injunctions elsewhere to maintain silence) to proclaim among his own people what great things *the Lord* had done for him. Jesus does not seem ordinarily to have called God 'Lord';[1] Lk substitutes 'God' (Lk viii 39), the word 'Lord' being equivocal for the Christian reader. It is not unlikely that Mk may have used it here for that very reason: at any rate, the man subsequently proclaims what *Jesus* had done for him (verse 20).

1. *The country of the Gerasenes.* This is probably the right reading in Mk and Lk. Some texts have *Gergesenes.* Mt has *Gadarenes.* It is difficult to make out the precise locality. Gadara is too far south. There was a Gerasa on the confines of Arabia, which again does not fit. The reading 'Gergesenes' is generally regarded as a conjecture of Origen's, based on Gen x 16; but Josephus expressly states that the 'Girgashites' there mentioned had disappeared, 'for

---

[1] See Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, E.T., p. 179.

the Hebrews destroyed their cities'.[1] Sanday and others identify the spot with the modern *Khersa* or *Kersa*, near Magdala.[2] Schürer, who points out that a ship often occurs upon coins issued at *Gadara*, thinks that though the city was about eight miles from the Lake, its 'territory' may have extended to the coast.[3] Mk's narrative, however, certainly seems to imply a 'city' in the immediate vicinity (verse 14). Bacon says simply that Mk was ignorant of the geography in detail, and thought of the well-known city of Gerasa, in spite of the fact that it was two hard days' journey from the Lake.

2. *Out of the tombs.* Demons were popularly believed to haunt cemeteries. The 'tombs' in question will have been, as commonly in Palestine, caverns, whether natural or artificial, in the rock.

3–4. On the maniacal strength frequently exhibited by persons mentally deranged see J. A. Hadfield's essay on 'The Psychology of Power' in *The Spirit* (B. H. Streeter and others, 1919).

6. *Worshipped him*: the Greek does not imply more than an act of homage or obeisance.

7. *What have I to do with thee?* Cf. i 24, and see notes *ad loc.* On the recognition of Jesus by the demons see pp. xlix sq., 258 sqq.

Son of the Most High God. It is possible that Mk, by giving this somewhat unusual turn to the demoniac's acknowledgement of Jesus' divine Sonship, means to indicate that the man was a heathen. It is true that, as Wellhausen rather sarcastically remarks, the demons in whose name he speaks were presumably 'neither Jew nor Gentile'. But the episode takes place upon heathen soil, and there is evidence that the title *Most High God* was applied by heathens to the God of Israel. It is so used in the Book of Daniel (Dan iii 26, iv 2), and it appears in the Hellenistic period as an epithet of various Semitic *baals*, who as 'lords of the sky' were identified in half-Jewish, half-heathen circles with the 'Most High' of Jewish worship.[4] Harnack, comparing Acts xvi 17 and other passages in the writings of S. Lk, is disposed to think that the phrase is specifically Lucan, and to suggest that its presence in the text of Mk v 7 is due to assimilation from Lk viii 28.[5]

I adjure thee by God. Mt and Lk omit or modify this, perhaps as being too shocking in the mouth of a demon. The phrase was a formula used in Jewish exorcism, and Lagrange remarks that there is a certain piquancy in its use here by the demon in addressing Jesus.

15. *Clothed*: it is to be inferred that the man had previously been in the habit of going about naked: cf. Lk viii 27.

19. The exception to the usual injunction of secrecy is commonly

---

[1] Josephus, *Antiquities* I vi 2.

[2] Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, pp. 25 sqq., 92 sq.

[3] Schürer II i 104.

[4] Cf. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur*, pp. 107 sqq., and Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, pp. 189 sqq.

[5] Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, E.T., p. 51.

explained by pointing out that since the scene is laid outside Jewish territory proper, and, moreover, the Lord is leaving the district, the ordinary objections to the publication of the facts do not apply. Wrede, however, thinks that the exception is only apparent: that the Lord only means that the man is to inform his own family and friends: and that the subsequent publication of the story throughout Decapolis is in contravention of His wish.[1]

20. *Decapolis.* The word means 'a league of ten cities', and refers to a group of cities east of the Jordan, which had been organized on the Greek model under the Seleucid kings, conquered by the Jews under John Hyrcanus, and subsequently liberated by Pompey. The best known of them were Damascus, Gadara, Scythopolis, and Pella.[2]

21–24. *On the way to Jaïrus' house*

(Cf. Mt ix 18–19; Lk viii 40–42)

21 And when Jesus had crossed over again in the boat unto
the other side, a great multitude was gathered unto him:
22 and he was by the sea. And there cometh one of the rulers
of the synagogue, Jaïrus by name; and seeing him, he
23 falleth at his feet, and beseecheth him much, saying, My
little daughter is at the point of death: *I pray thee*, that
thou come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be made
24 whole,[1] and live. And he went with him; and a great
multitude followed him, and they thronged him.

[1] Or, *saved.*

It is usually assumed that the scene of this episode, which Mk vaguely indicates as *by the sea*, was Capernaum or its neighbourhood. A Jewish synagogue had a body of 'elders' or 'rulers', who, however, are distinguished in inscriptions and other sources from the *archisynagogus* or 'Ruler of the Synagogue': the 'elders' exercised discipline, and generally directed the affairs of the community; the *archisynagogus* was charged with the specific function of controlling the conduct of public worship, and as a rule each synagogue had only one such 'ruler' (see, however, Acts xiii 15). Probably what is here meant is simply 'one of the class of synagogue-rulers', i.e. a Jewish notable who held that rank.[3] The Western Text omits the words *Jaïrus by name*, and the name does not occur subsequently in the narrative, or in the Matthaean parallel. Lk, however, probably read it in his text of Mk (cf. Lk viii 41), so that its absence in the Western Text is probably due to accidental omission. Some scholars, however, derive the name from a Hebrew word meaning 'he will awaken' (*sc.* from the sleep of death), and think that it is an insertion into the narrative, and was chosen for its appropriateness; but this does not seem very probable. The great man falls at the feet of Jesus, forgetting his dignity in the urgency of his entreaty. The diminutive (*my little daughter*) heightens the pathos.

---

[1] Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, pp. 140–141.
[2] On the 'ten cities alliance', see Schürer II i 61, 62.
[3] On the office of 'Ruler of the Synagogue', see Schürer II ii 63 sqq.

23. *That she may be made whole, and live.* The two phrases are virtually equivalent. *Save* (see R.V. mg.) is used for 'restore to health' in verses 28, 34, and in vi 56, x 52. On the Semitic use of 'to make alive' (= 'to heal') see notes on iii 1–6 (p. 35).

25–34. *The woman with the issue*

(Cf. Mt ix 20–22; Lk viii 43–48)

25 And a woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years,
26 and had suffered many things of many physicians, and had
spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather
27 grew worse, having heard the things concerning Jesus,
28 came in the crowd behind, and touched his garment. For
she said, If I touch but his garments, I shall be made whole.[1]
29 And straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up;
and she felt in her body that she was healed of her plague.[2]
30 And straightway Jesus, perceiving in himself that the
power *proceeding* from him had gone forth, turned him
about in the crowd, and said, Who touched my garments?
31 And his disciples said unto him, Thou seest the multitude
32 thronging thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me? And
he looked round about to see her that had done this thing.
33 But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what had
been done to her, came and fell down before him, and told
34 him all the truth. And he said unto her, Daughter, thy
faith hath made thee whole;[3] go in peace, and be whole of
thy plague.[2]

[1] Or, *saved.*
[2] Gr. *scourge.*
[3] Or, *saved thee.*

On Mk's fondness for dove-tailing one story into another see notes on iii 22–30. The story of the woman with the issue here serves to delay the journey to the house of Jaïrus until the arrival of the messengers in verse 35 suggesting that it is too late for our Lord's coming to be of any avail. The depreciation of the medical profession in verse 26 (characteristically softened down in Lk viii 43, where the Western Text indeed omits altogether the statement that she *had spent all her living upon physicians*) has many parallels in ancient authors. Lagrange remarks that in the East even to-day it is common in the case of serious disorders to employ a multiplicity of doctors, whose diagnoses and prescriptions, frequently conflicting, result only in the expenditure of money to no purpose, while the malady grows worse. It is probable that the woman's disease was such as to render her ceremonially unclean (Lev xv 25); in any case it was difficult to attract our Lord's attention in such a crowd, and the nature of her complaint was such that she would hesitate to avow it in public. Her action proceeded from the natural, if somewhat superstitious, idea that a kind of supernatural virtue went forth from the great Healer, and might be disseminated even by His garments (cf. Acts xix 12, v 15). According to Mt ix 20, Lk viii 44 she touched the 'tassel' of our Lord's robe (cf. Num xv 38, R.V. mg.).[1] Those who think it worth while to rationalize the miracle-stories in detail commonly suppose that her experience of immediate cure (verse 29) was the result of auto-suggestion. The story in Mk is told from a quite different point of view. The Lord Himself is represented as becoming mysteriously aware that a miracle has been wrought, as though by a 'power' proceeding from His person, but without knowing who was the person healed. He turns and asks, *Who touched my garments?* The disciples remonstrate—a touch which Mt and Lk suppress—but the Lord ignores them and looks about Him, still waiting for the answer to His question. The *fear and trembling* of the woman is perhaps to be regarded as due not only to natural self-consciousness at becoming so conspicuously the centre of attention, but also to doubt as to our Lord's attitude to one who had sought to draw upon His miraculous power without His knowledge: she may even have feared lest He should now reverse the miracle: she feels like a detected criminal confessing a crime, and so she falls trembling at His feet. The Lord reassures her with affectionate words, addressing her as *Daughter*, informing her that her cure is the reward of her implicit faith, and bidding her go in peace. Bacon regards the words *thy faith hath made thee whole* as intended 'to counteract the disposition to see in the event a "holy coat" miracle instead of a true "faith" cure'. This seems extremely doubtful. The Lord, in any case, does not describe the cure as a case of 'faith-healing' in the modern sense, as though the woman had been cured because she believed that she was cured. For Him, as for her, the cure is the work of God, conditioned but not caused by the woman's faith: nor does the narrative represent Him as guarding against the view that God's grace had been mediated by her touch upon His clothes. It is noticeable that Mt so modifies the story as to suggest that the healing followed upon the words of Christ. He seems to have been shocked by this miracle of which Jesus was not the author. But this does not mean that his account is more primitive than that of Mk; on the contrary, the changes which he introduces are the result of later reflection.

---

[1] The agreement of Mt and Lk here is striking, but need not imply that they derived the story from a common source other than Mk. It was natural for any one familiar with Jewish customs to think of the 'tassel'; cf. also Mk vi 56 which appears to be a generalized description modelled upon this episode. D and a number of Old Latin authorities omit the reference to the 'tassel' from the text of Lk, perhaps rightly; in which case the agreement of Mt and Lk against Mk disappears.

28–29. A comparison with iii 10 suggests that this story has been drawn upon for the generalized description of cures in iii 7–12; cf. especially the use of the word *scourge* (so Gk.) and the idea that a cure could be obtained by touching our Lord in the crowd.

34. *Go in peace.* Cf. 1 Sam i 17, xxix 7, 2 Sam xv 9. The phrase is not a mere formula of dismissal, but a word of reassurance that all is well. Henceforward there will be no recurrence of her malady.

A number of legends subsequently grew up about the woman who is the subject of this story. Eusebius mentions a tradition that she came from Paneas (= Caesarea Philippi), and describes a group in bronze, still extant there in his time, representing a woman kneeling as though in prayer, with her hands outstretched towards the figure of a man, who in turn extends his hand towards the woman. Local tradition identified the kneeling figure with the woman with the issue of blood, and the erect male figure with the Saviour.[1] It has been thought that the group really represented a woman being healed by Aesculapius, but if so it would probably have been unmistakably recognizable as such. Lagrange is no doubt right in thinking that the statue was a funeral monument representing a woman stretching out her hands in longing for her dead husband, and being consoled by him. The apocryphal *Acts of Pilate* gives the name of the woman with the issue as *Bernice* or *Beronice*, or in the Latin and Coptic versions *Veronica*.

35–43. *The raising of Jaïrus' daughter*

(Cf. Mt ix 23–26; Lk viii 49–56)

35 While he yet spake, they come from the ruler of the synagogue's *house*, saying, Thy daughter is dead: why troublest
36 thou the Master[1] any further? But Jesus, not heeding[2]
the word spoken, saith unto the ruler of the synagogue,
37 Fear not, only believe. And he suffered no man to follow

[1] Or, *Teacher*. [2] Or, *overhearing*.

---

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.* VII xviii.

with him, save Peter, and James, and John the brother of
38 James. And they come to the house of the ruler of the
synagogue; and he beholdeth a tumult, and *many* weeping
39 and wailing greatly. And when he was entered in, he
saith unto them, Why make ye a tumult, and weep? the
40 child is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to
scorn. But he, having put them all forth, taketh the father
of the child and her mother and them that were with him,
41 and goeth in where the child was. And taking the child
by the hand, he saith unto her, Talitha cumi; which is,
42 being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, Arise. And
straightway the damsel rose up, and walked; for she was
twelve years old. And they were amazed straightway with
43 a great amazement. And he charged them much that no
man should know this: and he commanded that *something*
should be given her to eat.

According to Bacon, the father, in applying to Jesus, had to overcome the resistance of his household, who regard it as 'worse than undignified' on the part of a ruler of the synagogue to appeal for help to 'the carpenter-healer': they now seek 'under the form of courtesy' to 'prevent the coming of an unwelcome guest', and Jesus disregards the message (verse 36) because of its 'veiled hostility': the utterance of verse 39 shows that He 'does not accept the pessimistic statement of the messengers'. Other recent commentators, who, like Bacon, assume that the case was one of temporary syncope and not of death, claim verse 39 as evidence that Jesus' diagnosis was the same as theirs. The difficulty is that, according to the narrative, our Lord is not supposed to see the body of the child until verse 40 when He *goeth in where the child was.* This difficulty is commonly evaded by supposing that the Lord's words are an expression of His 'faith': He is conscious of a 'call' or 'mission' to heal the child, and therefore it *cannot* be true that she is really dead: and the sequel justifies the 'faith' of Jesus.

Assuming the narrative to have an historical basis, it is plainly impossible now to determine, except on *a priori* grounds, what the original facts may have been. What is certain is that the view of the story just expounded is not a true exegesis of S. Mk. Bacon's assumption of disagreement between Jaïrus and his household finds no support in the text and is entirely hypothetical. The simplest explanation of the message brought from Jaïrus' house is the natural one that the messengers meant what they said, and that Jesus did not 'disregard' but 'overheard' the message (so rightly R.V. mg.). The words addressed to the mourners, perhaps designedly ambiguous, mean really that the death of the child is not the end of the story, that her 'death' is comparable to a 'sleep' from which she will arise. The Evangelist may further have intended the words to suggest to his readers the Christian view of death in general—it is not the pagan *sopor aeternus*: it is a sleep which looks forward to an awakening.[1] That in this story he meant to describe a resurrection, and not merely a recovery from a swoon, appears unquestionable.

35. *They come*, i.e. 'people came' (cf. ii 18, iii 2, and possibly iii 21). *Why troublest thou the Master?* The verb rendered *troublest* means literally to 'flay' or 'mangle', but had acquired in late Gk. a weakened meaning. See W. C. Allen's note *ad loc.*, and cf. the use in English of the word 'worry'. For Master (= Rabbi) cf. iv 38.

37. The crowd may perhaps be supposed to have turned back on hearing of the news brought by the messengers, assuming that a cure was now out of the question and that the Lord's visit was simply one of condolence. The whole body of 'the Twelve' would be too many to take into the house. The three disciples named appear as the Lord's chosen intimates on two subsequent occasions in Mk (ix 2, xiv 33).

38. The word *many* does not represent anything in the Gk. text, but is wrongly interpolated by the translators, who seem to have been unconsciously influenced by Mt ix 23. But Mt, who suppresses the coming of the messengers with their announcement, and represents the child as being already dead when the father approaches Jesus (Mt ix 18), consistently thinks of the funeral 'wake' as being already afoot when our Lord reaches the house: hence the 'crowd' and the 'flute-players'. As Mk tells the story, there would have been no time for professional mourners to be hired, or an extraneous crowd brought into the house. Those who were found *weeping and wailing greatly* would be not 'many' but few, viz.: the actual members of Jaïrus' household. They are naturally incredulous when the Lord declares that *the child is not dead, but sleepeth*, and Jesus insists on their extrusion. There must be quiet while He visits the death-chamber.

41. *Talitha cumi*, i.e. 'Maid, arise.' The Evangelist gives the original Aramaic, adding for the benefit of his Roman readers a Gk. translation expanded by the addition of the words *I say unto thee.* For similar scraps of Aramaic in this Gospel cf. vii 34, xiv 36 ('*Abba*'), xv 34. The Western Text here has a variant *rabbithabita*, which Wellhausen, followed by Allen, regards as a corruption of

---

[1] Cf. 1 Thess iv 13–15, Jn xi 11, and the Christian use of the term *cemetery* (= 'sleeping-place'). J. A. Symonds, describing the tomb of the young Cardinal Jacopo di Portogallo in the Church of San Miniato near Florence, justly contrasts 'the sublimity of the slumber that is death' suggested by Rossellino's monument with 'the genii of eternal repose modelled by Greek sculptors' who knew no hope in death, remarking that 'the Christian cannot thus conceive the mystery of the soul "fallen on sleep"' (*The Renaissance in Italy* iii, pp. 153–154).

another Aramaic word, *rabitha*, which also means 'maiden'. Lagrange disputes this, and thinks *thabita* or *thabitha* has arisen by confusion with Acts ix 40. It has been suggested that the foreign words were regarded as a magic formula. Origen remarks that it is well known that spells and incantations lose their power if translated into another language.[1] Is it to guard against such an idea that the Evangelist deliberately translates them?

She was twelve years old. The coincidence with the number of years that the woman with the issue had been a sufferer *may* have suggested the association of the two stories, but is more probably a chance coincidence.

43. The injunction of silence appears peculiarly difficult here, for how could the facts be concealed? Mk may simply have introduced it as a matter of course, in accordance with his usual theory. On the other hand, if we are right in thinking that the facts are as yet known only to the members of Jaïrus' household (see on verse 38 above), it would be possible to conceal them until our Lord had had time to get away from the locality. The last clause is noted by T. R. Glover as characteristic of our Lord's sense of the sober realities of a situation: He 'reminded a too happy father that his little girl would be the better of food'.[2] Certainly a most lifelike touch.

CHAPTER VI

1–6 a. *Jesus rejected in His own country*

(Cf. Mt xiii 53–58; Lk iv 16–30)

1 And he went out from thence; and he cometh into his own
2 country; and his disciples follow him. And when the
sabbath was come, he began to teach in the synagogue:
and many[1] hearing him were astonished, saying, Whence
hath this man these things? and, What is the wisdom that
is given unto this man, and *what mean* such mighty works[2]
3 wrought by his hands? Is not this the carpenter, the son
of Mary, and brother of James, and Joses, and Judas, and
Simon? and are not his sisters here with us? And they
4 were offended[3] in him. And Jesus said unto them, A pro-

[1] Some ancient authorities read *the many*, i. e. 'the majority'.
[2] Gr. *powers*.
[3] Gr. *caused to stumble*.

---

[1] *Contra Celsum* v 65.
[2] Glover, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, p. 125.

phet is not without honour, save in his own country, and
5 among his own kin, and in his own house. And he could
there do no mighty work,[1] save that he laid his hands upon
6 a few sick folk, and healed them. And he marvelled
because of their unbelief.

---

[1] Gr. *power*.

Patriotism according to Greek ideas attached rather to a man's city than to his country. The ambiguous word here rendered *country* might mean either 'native land' or 'native town'. A comparison with i 9 suggests that it here denotes Nazareth. It does not necessarily imply that the Evangelist thought that our Lord had been born there, since on any view He had been brought up at Nazareth, and had His home there, which might have been regarded as sufficient grounds for speaking of it as His 'country'. On the other hand Mk nowhere hints that he had any other view of our Lord's birthplace, and it is possible that the tradition which connected His birth with Bethlehem was not yet known to him. On the whole, however, the most probable view is that Mk was not thinking of the Lord's place of birth at all. He means to describe how our Lord went to Nazareth, where His home was, and was there rejected: and the reason why such a story was worth chronicling in a Gospel designed for Roman readers was that it both symbolized the rejection of the Messiah by His own people, and also enshrined a saying of Jesus which explained that such treatment was all of a piece with the general lot of prophets. Since this is the purpose of the story from the point of view of Mk he substitutes the word *country* (which could be taken as meaning 'fatherland') for the place-name Nazareth, in order to make clearer the application which he intends: moreover, by so doing he is enabled to echo in verse 1 the phraseology of the proverb quoted by Jesus in verse 4.

The Lord reaches Nazareth attended by His disciples: there is no *empressement* to welcome Him, and He has to wait for the Sabbath service in the synagogue for an opportunity of teaching. The majority of His hearers are impressed in spite of themselves, but if they are 'half amazed', they are also 'half annoyed' (Montefiore). They have heard the rumour of His 'works of power'—they do not deny the facts—and now they have heard His teaching for themselves. But they cannot believe in the greatness or in the mission of One whom they have known in His boyhood, and whose family are the simple folk they know so well. So they take offence at Him. The Lord quotes what appears to be a popular proverb—the addition of the reference to *his own kin* and *his own house* no doubt means that His 'brethren' too, at this time, shared the general attitude. That at a later stage they adhered to the Gospel we know from 1 Cor ix 5: if the 'brethren of the Lord' to whom S. Paul there refers are the four who are here enumerated, that will explain why Mk knows their names, whereas the names of the sisters have been forgotten. The Lord is astonished at His cold reception (verse 6): the general atmosphere in Nazareth was such that apart from a few unimportant cures no 'mighty work' was possible there.

3. *Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?* The word rendered *carpenter* generally has that meaning, but might refer to any artisan. Justin Martyr says that our Lord made 'ploughs and yokes';[1] Hilary takes Him to have been bred a smith.[2] Origen in reply to a sneer of Celsus denies that the Lord was described as an artisan in any of the Gospels current in the Church.[3] He may have forgotten this passage, or he may have read it in a text assimilated to that of Mt, who has *Is not this the carpenter's son?* (Mt xiii 55). A few of the less important Gk. MSS.[4] have this reading also in Mk, and some scholars accept it as original, but probably wrongly. It appears plainly due to assimilation with the text of Mt. The tendency would be to alter Mk's phrase: Christian sentiment probably disliked the idea of the Lord having been Himself a workman in early manhood. Modern feeling sees rather in the historical fact that the Son of God was what is now called a 'working man' the consecration and dignity of labour. The fact that Mk does not refer to Joseph, but describes Jesus as *the son of Mary* is commonly explained by the supposition that Joseph was by this time dead. Jewish usage, however, does not elsewhere describe men by reference to their mothers, but by reference to their fathers, irrespective of the question whether the father was still alive. The nearest analogy in the O.T. appears to be the case of Jephthah (Jdgs xi 1), which suggests that the description here put into the mouth of the men of Nazareth,[5] viz. *the carpenter, the son of Mary*, is intended to be insulting. To describe a man as the son of his mother, rather than of his father, may have conveyed the insinuation that his paternity was unknown. If so, it is intelligible that Mt should alter the offensive phrase, and substitute *the carpenter's son* as the appropriate thing for the people of Nazareth to say, his own view of the birth of Jesus being given in the first chapter of his Gospel, and the Jewish insinuation perhaps hinted at in the references to Tamar (Mt i 3), and the wife of Uriah (Mt i 6) in the genealogy which affirmed that Jesus was legally the heir of David. If these conclusions are justified, it follows (though the inference is not a certain one) that Mk may have been acquainted both with the Christian tradition of Virgin Birth and with the Jewish insinuation of illegitimacy. There seems no real evidence that either Jews or the generality of Christians in early times

---

[1] *Dialogue* 88; cf. the apocryphal *Gospel of Thomas* xi 1.

[2] *Fabri erat filius ferrum igne vincentis* (Hilary on Mt xiii).

[3] *Contra Celsum* vi 36.

[4] So, too, the Old Latin has *fabri filius et Mariae.*

[5] We ought not, of course, to assume that the villagers' gossip was reported *verbatim* thirty to forty years later.

accepted the paternity of Joseph, though certain unorthodox Christian sects appear to have done so in the second century.

The brother of James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon. The theory of the perpetual virginity of our Lord's Mother had not yet arisen when this Gospel was written. Later ecclesiastical tradition argued that the Lord's 'brothers' were either His reputed half-brothers, children of Joseph by a former marriage (so Epiphanius and Origen), or else His cousins (so Jerome and others). Tertullian and Helvidius among ancient writers defended the more natural interpretation.

5. *He could there do no mighty work.* Mk modifies this phrase, which probably seemed to him derogatory to our Lord's power, thereby missing the point that to work cures was not morally possible in the face of unbelief. It is not necessary to suppose with Holtzmann and others that our Lord tried and failed—a theory which is quite false to the spirit of Mk's narrative. Some scholars think that the words *save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them* were added subsequently to the text as a 'rectifying gloss'.

6 b–13. *The mission of the Twelve*

(Cf. Mt ix 35, x 1, 9–11, 14 ; Lk ix 1–6)

6 b And he went round about the villages teaching.
7 And he called unto him the twelve, and began to send them
forth by two and two; and he gave them authority over the
8 unclean spirits; and he charged them that they should take
nothing for *their* journey, save a staff only; no bread,
9 no wallet, no money[1] in their purse;[2] but *to go* shod with
10 sandals: and, *said he*, put not on two coats. And he said
unto them, Wheresoever ye enter into a house, there abide
11 till ye depart thence. And whatsoever place shall not
receive you, and they hear you not, as ye go forth thence,
shake off the dust that is under your feet for a testimony
12 unto them. And they went out, and preached that *men*
13 should repent. And they cast out many devils,[3] and
anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.

---

[1] Gr. *brass*. [2] Gr. *girdle*. [3] Gr. *demons*.

The wandering missionary was a familiar figure in the Hellenistic age. 'Long before the preachers of Christianity carried their new Gospel through the world, heathen preachers in rough philosopher's cloak, equipped with staff and wallet, had travelled barefoot and penniless the same roads.'[1] The Church followed similar methods, and the importance of the part thus played by itinerant mission work in the earliest propaganda of Christianity explains the prominence in the Synoptic Gospels of material adapted to serve as the marching orders of a missionary. It would seem that 'Q' already contained such a 'missionary discourse'; Mk's version no doubt represents a brief summary of the parallel Roman tradition ('Q^R'). Lk reproduces Mk here for the mission of the Twelve; 'Q' (which Mt combines with Mk) he uses subsequently for the mission of the Seventy (Lk x 1–16), which in his Gospel symbolizes the mission of Christianity to the Gentiles, as that of the Twelve symbolizes the mission to Israel.[2] The matter common to Mk and 'Q' appears for the most part in both contexts in Lk.

Mk appears to attach more importance to the mission itself than to the instructions, which perhaps he presupposes as well known. The purpose of the section is to explain the origin of Christian missions generally, by tracing them to the Lord's appointment of the Twelve. According to Mk iii 14 they had originally been chosen with this end in view, and now Jesus for the first time sends them out. It was while He was Himself engaged in a tour of Galilaean villages (verse 6 b). The statement that He *began to send them out* need not necessarily imply that this mission was the first of a series, but only that Jesus had not done this hitherto. Wellhausen regards it as unlikely that the Twelve were actually thus sent out at all in Jesus' lifetime, and thinks that the whole account has only symbolical and ideal truth; but probably this is at least partly because he regards Mk as earlier in date than 'Q'. The fact of the instructions occurring in 'Q' as well as in Mk, on the assumption of an early date for the document 'Q', makes it probable that they are based, for the most part, on actually remembered words of Jesus, especially if we are right in thinking that 'Q' and Mk represent independent lines of tradition; and the extremely primitive ring of the discourse in question tells decidedly on the same side: cf. also 1 Cor ix 14. The saying preserved in Mt ix 37 sq., Lk x 2 appears to imply that others besides our Lord had engaged in the work of spreading the good news, and that even so the 'labourers' were too 'few' for the abundant 'harvest'. There is, in fact, no reason that can be given why our Lord should *not* on a particular occasion have sent out the Twelve to preach in Galilee, and given them instructions how to proceed: it has even been suggested that it was this more widespread activity of our Lord and His band of disciples over the countryside as a whole which gave new prominence to His movement, and by attracting the attention of Herod (vi 14 sqq.) made Galilee dangerous and led to the avoidance later on of Herod's dominions (vii 24, 31, viii 27). It is noticeable that J. Weiss, who is not disposed to conservatism as a critic, accepts as historical the sending out of the disciples.[1] It is not necessary to infer with Schweitzer that the Lord anticipated the arrival of the Kingdom and the End of the Age before their return.[2]

---

[1] Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur*, p. 44. On Stoic and Cynic preachers see also Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, Bk. III, ch. ii, and J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, pp. 172 sqq.

[2] Jewish thought divided mankind into (*a*) the twelve tribes of Israel, and (*b*) the seventy heathen nations.

7. Abrahams notes that 'the twelve were sent forth "two by two", just as was the rule with Jewish collectors of alms'.[3] On the other hand, 'collectors of alms' is just what the Twelve were not to be, for this is probably the meaning of the prohibition of a *wallet* (verse 8)—the word so translated is used in Hellenistic Gk. to denote a religious beggar's collecting-bag.[4] The ideal of 'Holy Poverty', implicit in our Lord's instructions to the Twelve, was a new thing in Judaism, as Montefiore points out and Abrahams admits.

Authority over the unclean spirits. Montefiore notes that B. Weiss thinks that our Lord really only charged the disciples to heal diseases, and that Lk x 17 shows that the fact that they found themselves able to exorcize also was a surprise to them. This seems needless scepticism, though it is true that Mk shows a special tendency to lay stress on exorcism. It was certainly part of the triumphant consciousness of early Christianity that Christ had given His Church power or 'authority' over the demons.

8. *Save a staff only.* Mt and Lk forbid even a staff. So also in verse 9, which allows *sandals*, there is an apparent divergence from 'Q', since Mt forbids 'shoes' (Mt x 10) and Lk similarly forbids 'shoes' to the Seventy (Lk x 4). The directions in 'Q', viz. to go barefoot and without even a staff, were feasible to Orientals engaged only in a short tour of Galilaean villages: they would have been impossible to a missionary like S. Paul, doing long tramps over mountain ranges, and confronted by 'perils of robbers' (cf. 2 Cor. xi 26). The modifications in 'Q^{R}', therefore, if they are not accidental, are probably due to the fact that in the Roman version of the tradition the circumstances of later missionaries were in view.

No money in their purse. An Oriental carries money in his *girdle* (see R.V. mg.): the word for *money* here (Gk. *brass*) prohibits even the smallest copper coins.

9. *And, said he, put not on two coats*: the *oratio obliqua* here passes into *oratio recta.* Mk appears to mean 'Do not have a second tunic under your mantle': Mt and Lk seem rather to suggest 'Do not take a change of clothes with you.'

10. Hospitality is the rule in the East. When the disciples reach an unknown village, it is not their business to demand hospitality,

---

[1] *S. N. T.* i, pp. 126–127; *Das Urchristentum*, p. 99.

[2] Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, pp. 356 sqq.

[3] Abrahams, *op. cit.*, i, p. 113.

[4] Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, E.T., p. 109.

it is the business of the villagers to offer it. On the other hand, 'forsaking the humbler hospitality of the first host for more luxurious quarters is a practice unworthy of the true evangelist' (Bacon). The *Didache* (early second century?) lays it down that an itinerant evangelist ought not to expect to be entertained for more than two or three days: if he demands to eat the bread of idleness for longer, he is a 'Christ-trafficker'.[1]

11. The symbolic gesture to be used in the case of an inhospitable and hostile village signified 'We have nothing in common with you: we do not wish to carry away even dust that belongs to you and to your village'. Cf. Acts xiii 51, xviii 6 (where S. Paul shakes his clothes, because he has already deposited his sandals according to custom at the synagogue door).

13. *Anointed with oil many that were sick.* The Lord Himself is not represented as using oil in healing sick persons. On the other hand it was so used in the early Church (cf. Jas v 14). Oil has always been regarded in the East as a medicinal panacea (cf. Lk x 34): Lagrange notes that it is still so used, and that 'the only modern refinement consists in rendering it aseptic'. In Mk vi 13, Jas v 14, however, the use of the oil appears to be in anticipation of a cure which is regarded as miraculous; in this sense the later 'sacrament of unction' has its roots in the N.T.

14–16. *The attitude of Herod*

(Cf. Mt xiv 1–2; Lk ix 7–9)

14 And king Herod heard *thereof*; for his name had become known: and he said,[1] John the Baptist[2] is risen from the
15 dead, and therefore do these powers work in him. But others said, It is Elijah. And others said, *It is* a prophet,
16 *even* as one of the prophets. But Herod, when he heard *thereof*, said, John, whom I beheaded, he is risen.

[1] Some ancient authorities read *they*. [2] Gr. *the Baptizer.*

The mention of Herod here can only be explained on the assumption that his attitude at some stage in our Lord's ministry became threatening (cf. Lk xiii 31) and necessitated the withdrawal of Jesus from his dominions. Mk makes our Lord leave Herod's jurisdiction possibly in vi 45, certainly in vii 24; henceforth He appears chiefly in the Decapolis (vii 31), in the territory of Philip (viii 27), or in the parts about Tyre and Sidon (vii 24, 31): or, again, He traverses Galilee *incognito* (ix 30). His doings have already been reported to the Government (iii 6), and it is possible (see above) that it was the mission-tour of the disciples which finally convinced Herod that the matter was serious. Loisy remarks that Herod, speaking as a political ruler, may actually have said very much what he is reported to have said in verse 16 (on verse 14, see below): he has put down one dangerous popular movement, in which religious excitement might easily lead to political disturbance, by the arrest and execution of its instigator: now he finds himself confronted by another, 'It is John the Baptist over again!'

---

[1] *Didache* xii.

Lk omits the story of the Baptist's end which Mk appends to this section, probably because he thought it misplaced. He notices the imprisonment of John at an earlier stage (Lk iii 19–20), and Mk himself makes Jesus' activity in Galilee subsequent to John's *arrest* (Mk i 14); it appears to be implied by verses 14 and 16 here that His fame as a prophet and wonder-worker was subsequent to the Baptist's *death*—see, however, Mt xi 2 sqq., Lk vii 18 sqq.

The whole section, with the story attached to it, is a further example of Mk's artistic 'dove-tailing' (see on iii 22–30, v 25 sqq.). The narrative about the Baptist serves to occupy the reader's attention until the return of the Twelve in vi 30 from the mission on which they were sent in vi 7.

14. *King Herod.* Actually Herod was 'tetrarch', not 'king', of Galilee (Mt and Lk correct Mk here), but it is possible enough that, like other Oriental puppet-rulers owning allegiance to Rome, he was inaccurately described as 'king' by his own subjects.

And he said. The verb should be read in the plural, with R.V. mg., i. e. 'and people were saying', &c. Popular superstition might easily regard Jesus as the Baptist come back from the dead, and equipped with power to work miracles. The fact that He proclaimed the near advent of the Kingdom led others to regard Him as Elijah, a view which our Lord Himself seems to have held about *John* (cf. Mt xi 14).

15. *A prophet, even as one of the prophets*, i. e. 'a prophet like one of the prophets of old'. These diverse popular estimates of Jesus are recalled by the disciples in viii 28.

17–29. *The story of the Baptist's death*

(Cf. Mt. xiv 3–12)

17 For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John,
and bound him in prison for the sake of Herodias, his brother
18 Philip's wife: for he had married her. For John said unto
Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.
19 And Herodias set herself against him, and desired to kill
20 him; and she could not; for Herod feared John, knowing
that he was a righteous man and a holy, and kept him safe.

And when he heard him, he was much perplexed;[1] and he
21 heard him gladly. And when a convenient day was come,
that Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords, and
22 the high captains,[2] and the chief men of Galilee; and when
the daughter of Herodias[3] herself came in and danced, she[4]
pleased Herod and them that sat at meat with him; and the
king said unto the damsel, Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt,
23 and I will give it thee. And he sware unto her, Whatsoever thou shalt ask of me, I will give it thee, unto the half
24 of my kingdom. And she went out, and said unto her
mother, What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John
25 the Baptist.[5] And she came in straightway with haste
unto the king, and asked, saying, I will that thou forthwith
26 give me in a charger the head of John the Baptist.[5] And
the king was exceeding sorry; but for the sake of his oaths,
27 and of them that sat at meat, he would not reject her. And
straightway the king sent forth a soldier of his guard, and
commanded to bring his head: and he went and beheaded
28 him in the prison, and brought his head in a charger, and
gave it to the damsel; and the damsel gave it to her mother.
29 And when his disciples heard *thereof*, they came and took
up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb.

[1] Many ancient authorities read *did many things*.
[2] Or, *military tribunes*. Gr. *chiliarchs*.
[3] Some ancient authorities read *his daughter Herodias*.
[4] Or, *it*.
[5] Gr. *the Baptizer*.

The account in Josephus of the intrigue of Herod with his brother's wife and of its connexion with the Baptist's death differs in important particulars from the Marcan story. Josephus' version is to the effect that Herod had married the daughter of Aretas, King of Arabia, but, falling in love with Herodias the wife of his half-brother, Herod, who was living as a private citizen at Rome, desired her to elope with him, which she agreed to do on condition that he divorced his wife. Herod's wife discovering this managed to escape to Arabia and inform her father of his intentions, with the result that Aretas made war upon Herod and defeated him. Josephus adds that 'some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as a punishment for what he did against John, who was called the Baptist', and proceeds to explain that John had been imprisoned at Machaerus and executed by Herod, because the latter feared that his power over the people might lead to a political rising.[1] If the mission of the Baptist began in the fifteenth year of Tiberius (Lk iii 1), i.e. in A. D. 28–29,[2] the most probable date for the execution of the Baptist would be A. D. 29–30. The date of Herod's defeat by Aretas was apparently A. D. 36, i.e. at least five or six years afterwards, which suggests either that Josephus was not infallible, or else that the Arabian war lasted longer than his account would at first sight lead the reader to suppose. On the other hand, it appears unlikely that the 'Herod' who was the original husband of Herodias bore the name of Philip, the well-known Herod Philip being another half-brother, who until his death in A. D. 34 was tetrarch of Ituraea and Trachonitis. Since this latter Philip is known to have married Herodias' daughter Salome, who is probably the *danseuse* of the Marcan story, it would seem that Mk has confused the name of Herodias' husband with that of her son-in-law. The year of Salome's marriage with Philip is quite unknown; it must be presumed to have been after, rather than before, the proceedings at Herod's court described in Mk. She is thought to have been born about A. D. 10,[3] and if so she would be about twenty at the time of the Baptist's death. There was a palace as well as a prison at Machaerus; the court, if the story in Mk is historical, must have been resident there at the time of Herod's birthday feast, though the Gospel taken by itself would more naturally suggest the Galilaean capital Tiberias as the scene of the banquet.[4] It is noticeable that Josephus assigns a political motive for the execution of the Baptist, is completely silent about the banquet-scene and the dancing, and regards Herod as directly responsible for the murder. In Mk Herod, though provoked by John's rebuke of his own proceedings to imprison him, nevertheless pays him great deference, hears him with perplexity of conscience (cf. S. Paul and Felix, Acts xxiv 24 sqq.), and purposes to spare his life until entrapped into a hasty plighting of his word. Many scholars, regarding the more sober version of Josephus as intrinsically more probable than the highly coloured popular story in Mk, are disposed to think that the latter is modelled upon the relations of Elijah with Ahab and Jezebel, the new Elijah, like the old, boldly rebuking the 'king', and the wicked queen plotting against his life. So also it is pointed out that the account of the banqueting scene shows the influence of the Book of Esther, since Herod, like Ahasuerus in Esth v 3, offers *the half of the kingdom*, which strictly he was not in a position to do, since he was no independent 'king' but an underling of Rome, and his dominions were not his to give away. But is the extravagant offer of an Oriental potentate excited by wine to be taken thus *au pied de la*

---

[1] Josephus, *Antiquities* xviii 5.

[2] Tiberius succeeded Augustus in A. D. 14.

[3] This is based on a calculation by Gutschmid accepted by Schürer (Schürer I ii 29).

[4] Machaerus was a frontier fortress near the Dead Sea. The dominions of Herod included Peraea as well as Galilee.

lettre? And may not Ahasuerus' words have been already proverbial? That a princess of the proud Herodian house should demean herself by dancing like a slave girl publicly in the presence of a half-intoxicated crowd of men is surprising, and it has been said that only those who have never seen an Oriental solo dance could regard it as credible; it is nevertheless not wholly incredible, however outrageous, to those who know anything of the morals of Oriental courts, or of Herod's family in particular.

Those who will may regard the account in Mk as a picturesque legend: it is certainly picturesque, and contains real historical difficulties. But the account in Josephus also is not free from difficulty. Both are no doubt *bona fide* and independent: it is a mistake to try to harmonize the two. Josephus' version will give the facts as they presented themselves to an historian who wrote sixty years later, and who was concerned to trace the political causes of a war. The story in Mk will be an account, written with a certain amount of literary freedom, of what was being darkly whispered in the bazaars or market-places of Palestine at the time: it has at least the value of reflecting faithfully the opinion entertained of Herod by his subjects, the shock to public opinion caused by his adulterous marriage, and the thrill of horror aroused by his execution of the great ascetic prophet of repentance.

18. *It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.* Herod's crime was in strictness adultery rather than incest: if his brother's wife had been a widow he might even have been required by Jewish law to marry her (Dt xxv 5), at least if he and his brother had 'dwelt together' and the brother had died childless. It was, however, forbidden to marry the wife of a brother during the latter's lifetime (Lev xviii 16, xx 21). This would probably have held good even if Herodias had been divorced: actually she seems simply to have deserted her husband or repudiated him by a process of 'divorce' recognized by Roman but not by Jewish law.[1]

21. *A convenient day*, i. e. 'an opportune day': there seems reason, however, to think that the word so translated might mean 'empty', 'leisured', and so 'a festival day'.[2] *Birthday*: this is probably the right translation: it has been proposed to interpret the Gk. word used here as 'accession day', but this is less likely. The word rendered *lords* occurs in the LXX of Esther i 3: it probably here means 'court officials', who with the 'military officers', loosely called *chiliarchs* (which properly meant military tribunes commanding a Roman cohort), and the 'notables' of Galilee made up the party.

22. *the daughter of Herodias*: the reading of R.V. mg. is strongly attested, but Salome was not Herod's daughter and Herodias was the name of the mother, not of the daughter. The girl was the daughter

---

[1] Jewish law allowed the husband in certain circumstances to divorce his wife, but not *vice versa*. See p. 135.

[2] Pallis, *A few notes on the Gospels according to S. Mark and S. Matthew*, pp. 11–12.

of Herodias by her original husband. *Came in*: thus doing what Vashti refused to do (Esth i 12); for a woman even to enter such an assembly was contrary to Oriental ideas of decency.

23. Cf. Esth v 3, 6, vii 2.

25. *In a charger*, i.e. on a dish. The girl apparently adds this gruesome witticism of her own initiative.

26. *Reject her*: translate 'break faith with her' (so Moulton and Milligan, following E. A. Abbott).

27. *A soldier of his guard*: the word used is a Latinism, a Gk. transliteration of *speculator*, which originally meant 'a scout'. It seems to have been current in Hellenistic Gk. in the sense of a royal attendant, who served as a messenger or courier, and, if need be, also as an executioner: so here.

29. *His corpse*: cf. xv 45, where the same word is used of the body of Jesus. Loisy thinks the parallel (and contrast) is intentional: so also Dr. Lock, who writes to me that 'the Gospel consists of *two* "Passion stories"—one ending in death, the other ending in Resurrection'.

30–32. *The return of the disciples and the attempt at retirement*

(Cf. Mt xiv 13 a; Lk ix 10)

30 And the apostles gather themselves together unto Jesus;
and they told him all things, whatsoever they had done,
31 and whatsoever they had taught. And he saith unto them,
Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while.
For there were many coming and going, and they had no
32 leisure so much as to eat. And they went away in the boat
to a desert place apart.

'The Apostles' is not in Mk a technical term for 'the Twelve' (see notes on iii 13–19 a): it is probable that in the genuine text it occurs here only and retains its proper meaning of '*missionaries*, sent out with authority to preach the Gospel', and in that sense it could be applied, as it *is* applied in the N.T., to a wider circle than that of the original 'twelve'. The latter are here called 'apostles' because they had just been acting, for the first time, as missionaries. Mk chronicles their return, the notice of which he had artistically delayed by the insertion of the episode about Herod and the Baptist, and utilizes the presumption that they would be in need of rest after their journey in order to provide a motive for bringing Jesus to the *desert place* where He is subsequently to feed the multitude.

31. *There were many coming and going*, i.e. there was a constant stream of people arriving and departing: the Lord and His disciples are besieged, as always, by the crowds.

33–44. *The first account of the feeding of the multitude*

(Cf. Mt xiv 13 b–21; Lk ix 11–17; Jn vi 1–13)

33 And *the people* saw them going, and many knew *them*, and they
ran there together on foot[1] from all the cities, and outwent
34 them. And he came forth and saw a great multitude, and he
had compassion on them, because they were as sheep not
having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things.
35 And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto
him, and said, The place is desert, and the day is now far
36 spent: send them away, that they may go into the country
and villages round about, and buy themselves somewhat to
37 eat. But he answered and said unto them, Give ye them
to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go and buy two
38 hundred pennyworth[2] of bread, and give them to eat? And
he saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? go *and* see.
39 And when they knew, they say, Five, and two fishes. And
he commanded them that all should sit down[3] by companies
40 upon the green grass. And they sat down in ranks, by
41 hundreds, and by fifties. And he took the five loaves and
the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and
brake the loaves; and he gave to the disciples to set before
42 them; and the two fishes divided he among them all. And
43 they did all eat, and were filled. And they took up broken
44 pieces, twelve basketfuls, and also of the fishes. And they
that ate the loaves were five thousand men.

---

[1] Or, *by land.*
[2] The word in the Greek denotes a coin worth about eightpence-halfpenny.
[3] Gk. *recline.*

The various attempts which have been made to rationalize this story are none of them very satisfactory. It has been supposed either that the scene is historical in everything except the figures, and that the story has grown out of the recollection that Jesus and His disciples once shared their provisions with the crowd: or, again, that they set the example in doing so, that others followed suit, and in the end it proved that there was food sufficient to go round: or that the meal was really a kind of love-feast, its significance consisting in the fact that the food was blessed by Christ, every one partaking of a fragment of this *pain bénit* and being spiritually refreshed, though not physically satisfied; yet others think that the story is mythical, and is in some way derived from, or influenced by, the account of the miracle of Elisha in 2 Kgs iv 42–44. Mk certainly understands the occurrence as miraculous:[1] on the other hand he does not here emphasize the wonder, as in other cases, by drawing attention to the astonishment of the bystanders, or representing our Lord as vainly enjoining secrecy. In vi 52, viii 17 sqq., the disciples are blamed for not 'understanding' the miracle of the loaves: a comparison with iv 13 seems to suggest that the Evangelist regarded the feeding of the multitude as conveying, like the parables, a hidden meaning. In Jn vi 26 sqq. this miracle is interpreted as a parable of the Eucharist: was something of this kind already in the mind of Mk?[2] It is significant that S. Paul, at an earlier date than that at which Mk wrote, had connected the Christian eucharist with the 'spiritual' (i. e. miraculous) 'food' which nourished Israel 'in the desert' (1 Cor x 3 sqq.). If, as seems probable, the feeding of the multitudes was commonly interpreted in early Christianity as typifying the heavenly Food whereby in the desert of this world the faithful are spiritually fed, and if, on account of the significance thus read into it, the story was regarded as of high importance and was constantly being told, we should have an explanation of its occurrence in all four of the Gospels and also, perhaps, of the fact that Mk and Mt appear to tell it twice. On the other hand, this does not appear to be a sufficient explanation of the *origin* of the story: it is not simply a piece of mythological symbolism, but will have had its basis in some incident which may be presumed to have actually occurred, and of which Mk vi 33–44 and viii 1–8 are apparently variant versions.[3] Both accounts, we must suppose, were in circulation, and Mk included both without recognizing them as 'doublets': their obvious similarity no one could fail to recognize—cf. Mk viii 19, 20: but in the words there attributed to our Lord the two episodes, though linked together, are expressly distinguished. We cannot but ask, however, why, in a Gospel so short as Mk's, which presents every appearance of being for the most part a selection of typical and specially significant anecdotes from the much larger number of stories about our Lord which must have been current in Apostolic times and circles, two such *similar* stories should have been included:[1] and it appears not impossible that there may be some truth in the suggestion of B. W. Bacon, who thinks that the feeding of the Five Thousand may be intended to symbolize the giving of the Bread of Life to Jews, and the feeding of the Four Thousand the giving of the Bread of Life to Gentiles.[2] The scene of the feedings is not precisely located, but the crowd in the first case which followed Jesus on foot when He went with His disciples in the boat is plainly a Galilaean crowd: the crowd of four thousand persons in viii 1–8 may be interpreted *in its Marcan context* as being drawn from the inhabitants of Decapolis (Mk vii 31); the eastern side of the Lake, where the majority of the 'ten cities' were situated, is apparently the scene: and the 'cities' were predominantly heathen. For an elaborate, if somewhat fanciful, study of the mystical significance of 'Christ's miracles of Feeding' see E. A. Abbott, *Miscellanea Evangelica (II)*.

---

[1] On the general question of the miracle-stories in the Gospel see *supra*, pp. 59 sqq., and Introduction, pp. xlvi sqq.

[2] Some scholars think rather of the supposed early Christian institution of the *Agape* or 'Love-Feast' than of the Eucharist proper. Batiffol, however, in *Études d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive* (i, pp. 283 sqq.), argues against the view that such common meals of the Church, as distinct from the Eucharist, ever existed in the manner which is commonly supposed.

[3] 'The reason for supposing the "Four Thousand" scene to be a doublet of the "Five Thousand" is not the assumption that such an event could only have occurred once, but the extreme difficulty of supposing that the memory of the first miracle could have been erased from the minds of the disciples so soon after its occurrence as to leave them in the state of perplexity depicted in viii 4. There we are told that the Lord called His disciples and said (vv. 2, 3), "I have compassion on the multitude, because they have been with me now for three days, etc.": to which the disciples return the helpless answer (verse 4) "Whence can one satisfy these men with bread here in the wilderness?" . . . To suppose that they had forgotten the first incident seems to postulate an almost incredible dullness on the part of the disciples. The considerations just adduced are equally cogent whatever view be taken of the objective truth of the narratives' (N. P. Williams, in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 419).

33. *On foot.* If the boat with our Lord and His disciples kept in sight of land, and had the wind against it, it might be perfectly possible for persons going on foot along the northern shore of the Lake to forestall its arrival at its destination, assuming that the landing was made at no great distance from the starting-point.

34. *He came forth*, i. e. from the boat, and not, as Hort supposed, from 'His retirement in some sequestered nook'. The crowd frustrates our Lord's attempt to find a place of 'retirement'. *As sheep not having a shepherd*: cf. 1 Kgs xxii 17; Ezek xxxiv 5; Mt xv 24.

36. *Send them away*, i. e. 'dismiss them'. *Country and villages*: tr. 'farms and villages'.

37. *Two hundred pennyworth of bread*: see R.V. mg. A *denarius* or 'penny' was a labourer's daily wage (Mt xx 2 sqq.). Some suppose that the Twelve between them might possibly have made up the sum of money named: others that it is meant as a minimum estimate of the amount required to buy a meagre meal for such a concourse as was present.

38. The disciples presumably *go and see* by returning to inspect the store of provisions in their boat; cf. however, Jn vi 9. The *loaves* are probably barley cakes, one to each thousand in the crowd; the

---

[1] For the theory that Mk vi 45–viii 26, reproduced (except viii 22–26) by Mt but omitted by Lk, formed originally no part of Mk's Gospel, but appeared only in a 'second edition', see Introd., pp. xxxvi sqq.

[2] The suggestion was made in patristic times; see Trench, *Notes on the Miracles*, p. 382, who refers to a sermon doubtfully ascribed to S. Augustine, and to a passage of Hilary.

fishes are 'a mere relish, and probably pickled or cooked. . . . Taricheae at the SW. corner of the Lake derived its name from the curing of fish' (Swete). Bread and fish appear frequently in early Christian frescoes in the catacombs as a symbol of the Eucharist.[1]

39. *Sit down by companies*: tr. 'recline company by company'. The grass would be green in Palestine only in the early spring: but the reference to *green grass* may be only a pictorial touch.

40. *In ranks.* The idiom is the same as in the previous verse—'rank by rank': the word rendered 'rank' is rare, and elsewhere is used of 'garden-plots', probably beds in a *vegetable* garden. We are not to think of the vivid contrast of colour between the many-hued Eastern clothes of the multitude standing out like beds of brightly coloured *flowers* against a background of green grass, but simply of the orderliness of their arrangement in companies.

41. *Looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake the loaves.* The Lord acts as a Jewish house-father at a meal: the usual form of blessing was a thanksgiving or *eucharist*, viz. 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who bringest forth bread from the earth'. Cf. our Lord's action at the Last Supper (xiv 22). For the attitude in prayer—*looking up to heaven*—cf. vii 34, Jn xi 41. The Western Church retains this attitude on the part of the celebrant in the Eucharist; cf. the words of the Roman canon, immediately before the consecration, '*et elevatis oculis ad te, etc.*'

He gave to the disciples to set before them. The disciples act as the deacons acted at early Christian eucharists.

43. *Twelve basketfuls.* The word used here for basket (*cophinus*) occurs in Juvenal to denote a basket commonly used by the poorer class of Roman Jews (Juv iii 14, vi 542); it is supposed to have meant a stout wicker basket. In viii 19, 20 a different word is used. Here the *twelve* baskets correspond to the twelve disciples, each of whom fills his basket with the fragments of the feast.

45–52. *The Walking on the Water*

(Cf. Mt xiv 22–33; Jn vi 15–21)

45 And straightway he constrained his disciples to enter into
the boat, and to go before *him* unto the other side to
Bethsaida, while he himself sendeth the multitude away.
46 And after he had taken leave of them, he departed into the
47 mountain to pray. And when even was come, the boat was
48 in the midst of the sea, and he alone on the land. And
seeing them distressed in rowing, for the wind was contrary
unto them, about the fourth watch of the night he cometh

---

[1] W. Lowrie, *Christian Art and Archaeology*, pp. 223 sqq.

unto them, walking on the sea; and he would have passed
49 by them: but they, when they saw him walking on the sea,
50 supposed that it was an apparition, and cried out: for they
all saw him, and were troubled. But he straightway spake
with them, and saith unto them, Be of good cheer: it is I;
51 be not afraid. And he went up unto them into the boat;
and the wind ceased: and they were sore amazed in them-
52 selves; for they understood not concerning the loaves, but
their heart was hardened.

This anecdote has traits in common with that of the stilling of the storm (iv 35–41), of which some commentators regard it as a variant tradition. That it was a favourite story in early Christian circles is clear, since it is one of the relatively few episodes which the Fourth Gospel has in common with the Synoptists (cf. Jn vi 15–21). To Mk's earliest readers it will have been full of significance, all the more so if this Gospel was written shortly after the martyrdoms of S. Peter and S. Paul.[1] To the Roman Church, thus bereft of its leaders and confronted by a hostile Government, it must have indeed appeared that *the wind was contrary* and progress difficult and slow: faint hearts may even have begun to wonder whether the Lord Himself had not abandoned them to their fate, or to doubt the reality of Christ. They are to learn from this story that they are *not* forsaken, that the Lord watches over them unseen, and that He Himself—no phantom, but the Living One, Master of winds and waves—will surely come quickly for their salvation, even though it be in *the fourth watch of the night.*

Loisy, on the other hand, appears fanciful in making the story *merely* symbolic and working it out as a detailed allegory, in which *the boat* corresponds to the 'ship of the Church', the parting of Jesus from His disciples symbolizes His separation from them by death, His ascent of the mountain to pray corresponds to His Resurrection and Ascension to the right hand of God, and His walking upon the water suggests His future coming upon the clouds. It is more probable that the kernel of the story reflects some actual historical reminiscence, the details of which cannot now with any certainty be recovered. The various attempts which have been made to explain the episode rationalistically seem markedly unsuccessful.

45. The disciples are reluctant to leave Jesus. Assuming that there is an authentic historical reminiscence behind Jn vi 15, it is possible to explain with Latham that our Lord, fearing a political interpretation of His Messiahship on the part of the crowd, 'hurried the disciples on board, that they might not catch the contagion of the

---

[1] See Introd., pp. xxvii sqq.

idea',[1] Himself subsequently dismissing the crowd and seeking solitude, in order to take counsel with God in prayer about the disturbing situation which had arisen. It is thought by others that verses 45, 46 are merely a transitional link supplied by the Evangelist: the disciples have to be separated from their Master, in order that He may subsequently rejoin them; an intelligible motive for His desire to be alone is provided by the assumption that He sought solitude in order to pray (cf. i 35); in this way the Evangelist (who, upon this view, is editing a fragmentary tradition) links on the episode of the walking on the water to that of the feeding of the multitude, and provides the situation (viz. the separation of the Master from the disciples) which the walking on the water presupposed.

To Bethsaida. The geography is vague; the boat starts for Bethsaida from *a desert place* (verse 32), the locality of which is not further specified, but which would appear to have been within walking distance of Capernaum (verse 33). The actual landing is made in the region of Gennesaret (verse 53), a level and extremely fertile plain to the south of Capernaum, which sometimes gave its name to the Lake as a whole. Some suppose that the boat was blown south by the contrary wind, others that the landing was made at Bethsaida as originally planned, but that the Lord and His disciples subsequently again crossed the Lake from Bethsaida to Gennesaret (so W. C. Allen, following the Western Text, which in verse 53 reads 'and having crossed over *thence* to the land they came to Gennesaret and moored'). It is possible that the Evangelist himself had no clear picture of the locality in his mind; to him, as to his readers, the various places he mentions may have been little more than names in the tradition, since he does not seem himself to have been a Galilaean, and his mother's house, if he is rightly identified with *John whose surname was Mark*, was at Jerusalem (Acts xii 12). Bethsaida in any case will be the well-known city to the north of the Lake, close to the point at which the Jordan flows into it, and lying just within the territory of Philip, who rebuilt it as Bethsaida-Julias.[2] The theory that there was more than one Bethsaida on the shores of the Lake is not based on any evidence, and is now generally abandoned.[3]

47. *In the midst of the sea* may mean 'half-way across', but does not necessarily mean more than 'a good way out from the shore'.

48. *About the fourth watch of the night,* i. e. about 3 a.m. The Evangelist follows the Roman reckoning of time. It is not clear why the Lord made as though He *would have passed by them*; the Greek means that He *wished* to do so—why? (Cf. Lk xxiv 28).

---

[1] Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, p. 307 (quoted by Swete).

[2] Josephus, *Antiquities* XVIII ii 1.

[3] The theory in question, which was never more than a precarious inference from Jn xii 21, is rejected both by Sir G. A. Smith (*Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 458) and by the late Dr. Sanday (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, pp. 41–42).

49–50. For the disciples' terror of the supernatural cf. iv 41. The commentators point out that there are parallels in the stories of the appearances of the Risen Christ to the disciples (cf. Mt xxviii 10, Lk xxiv 37–38).

51. The extreme terror of the disciples is again emphasized.

52. The disciples are 'still under the veil of Judaism, affected by its "hardening" (cf. vii 18, viii 17–19, Rom xi 7–8, Is xxix 10)' (B. W. Bacon). The contrast is striking with Mt xiv 33. In Mk it appears to be suggested that the episode of the walking on the water, like that of the feeding of the multitudes, enshrined a hidden meaning which was only understood subsequently, i. e. in the light of Christianity.

53–56. *The neighbourhood of Gennesaret*

(Cf. Mt xiv 34–36)

53 And when they had crossed over,[1] they came to the land
54 unto Gennesaret, and moored to the shore. And when they
55 were come out of the boat, straightway *the people* knew him,
and ran round about that whole region, and began to carry
about on their beds those that were sick, where they heard he
56 was. And wheresoever he entered, into villages, or into cities,
or into the country, they laid the sick in the marketplaces,
and besought him that they might touch if it were but the
border of his garment: and as many as touched him[2] were
made whole.

---

[1] Or, *crossed over to the land, they came unto Gennesaret.*

[2] Or, *it.*

A generalized description of healings and of popular enthusiasm: cf. i 32–34, iii 7–12. The word for 'bed' in verse 55 is the same as in ii 11–12; the phrase about touching the border of our Lord's garment recalls the story of the woman with the issue (*q.v.*). The Evangelist therefore appears to mean 'And there were many cures similar to those which I have already described'. The whole section is probably to be regarded as being simply an editorial summary, the enthusiasm of the crowds serving as a foil to the attitude of the official leaders of Judaism, to which renewed attention is drawn in the section which follows.

56. *Into villages, or into cities, or into the country*: the meaning is 'villages, townships, and scattered farms' (cf. v 14, vi 36)—'the combination covers every collection of dwellings, large or small' (Swete). *Marketplaces* existed strictly only in the 'cities', but the word is loosely used for the equivalent of our 'village greens'.

CHAPTER VII

1–23. *The question of unwashen hands and of scribal tradition*

(Cf. Mt xv 1–20)

1 And there are gathered together unto him the Pharisees,
and certain of the scribes, which had come from Jerusalem,
2 and had seen that some of his disciples ate their bread with
3 defiled,[1] that is, unwashen, hands. For the Pharisees, and
all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently,[2] eat
4 not, holding the tradition of the elders: and *when they come*
from the marketplace, except they wash themselves,[3] they
eat not: and many other things there be, which they have
received to hold, washings[4] of cups, and pots, and brasen
5 vessels.[5] And the Pharisees and the scribes ask him, Why
walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the
6 elders, but eat their bread with defiled[1] hands? And he
said unto them, Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites,
as it is written,

This people honoureth me with their lips,
But their heart is far from me.
7 But in vain do they worship me,
Teaching *as their* doctrines the precepts of men.

8 Ye leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the
9 tradition of men. And he said unto them, Full well do ye
reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your
10 tradition. For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy
mother; and, He that speaketh evil of father or mother,
11 let him die the death:[6] but ye say, If a man shall say to
his father or his mother, That wherewith thou mightest
have been profited by me is Corban, that is to say, Given
12 *to God*; ye no longer suffer him to do aught for his father

---

[1] Or, *common.*
[2] Or, *up to the elbow*, Gr. *with the fist.*
[3] Gr. *baptize.* Some ancient authorities read *sprinkle themselves.*
[4] Gr. *baptizings.*
[5] Many ancient authorities add *and couches.*
[6] Or, *surely die.*

13 or his mother; making void the word of God by your
tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like
14 things ye do. And he called to him the multitude again,
and said unto them, Hear me all of you, and understand:
15 there is nothing from without the man, that going into
him can defile him: but the things which proceed out of
17 the man are those that defile the man.[1] And when he was
entered into the house from the multitude, his disciples
18 asked of him the parable. And he saith unto them, Are ye
so without understanding also? Perceive ye not, that
whatsoever from without goeth into the man, *it* cannot
19 defile him; because it goeth not into his heart, but into his
belly, and goeth out into the draught? *This he said*,
20 making all meats clean. And he said, That which pro-
21 ceedeth out of the man, that defileth the man. For from
within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts[2] proceed,
22 fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wicked-
nesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride,
23 foolishness: all these evil things proceed from within, and
defile the man.

Verses 6, 7: cf. Is xxix 13 (LXX). Verse 10: cf. Ex xx 12, xxi 17.

---

[1] Many ancient authorities insert ver. 16 *If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear.*

[2] Gr. *thoughts that are evil.*

The battle on behalf of the freedom of Gentile Christians to dispense with the restrictions of the Jewish Law had been fought and won by the time this Gospel came to be written: the echoes of the controversy are, nevertheless, still audible in this section, and it is evident that for the Evangelist, as for his readers, any episode which could be interpreted as exhibiting our Lord in the light of a precursor, in principle, of the Pauline policy with regard to the Law had a special interest.

The historical attitude of our Lord with regard to the Law as a whole was no doubt, very broadly, that of the Sadducees: that is to say, the Law itself, as given by God, He regarded as binding, while rejecting *in toto*, as mere 'traditions of men', the Pharisaic regulations and oral precepts by which the actual written Law had come to be hedged about and amplified. At the same time, approaching the whole subject from the point of view of prophetic freedom, and with the authority of God's Anointed, He set the spirit above the letter, and distinguished, even within the four corners of the written Law itself, certain 'weightier matters' from other matters which were of less intrinsic importance.[1]

The discussion in the present section appears composite, and shows signs of editing. The original kernel or nucleus seems to be the question of the scribes and Pharisees (verses 1, 2, 5) and our Lord's reply (verses 14, 15): the Evangelist has combined with it a general attack by our Lord upon the principle of scribal traditions, as illustrated especially by the 'Corban' case (verses 9–13), which possibly came to him from a different source or in a different connexion; has interpolated (for the benefit of his Gentile readers) an editorial note on Jewish ceremonial washings in general (verses 3, 4), together with a polemical quotation from Isaiah (verses 6, 7), the point of which is emphasized by verse 8 (a duplicate of verse 9); and has added (1) an esoteric instruction addressed to the disciples (verses 17–19), in which the answer given to the scribes and Pharisees is interpreted as amounting to an abrogation in principle of Jewish regulations about food, and (2) a further comment on our Lord's reply (repeated in verse 20) applying it to the case of a number of characteristic vices which were rampant in the Gentile world. The general structure of this catena of conflated sayings, and the various editorial links by which the joins appear to be betrayed (verses 6, 9, 14, 17–18, 20), should be compared with the corresponding phenomena in Chapter IV.

1. *Scribes, which had come from Jerusalem*: cf. iii 22 and see note *ad loc.* The locality of the present episode is not stated. Mk introduces it at this point in his narrative, perhaps by way of an appropriate prelude to verses 24 sqq., in which Jesus forsakes Jewish for Gentile soil.

2. *Defiled, that is, unwashen.* Mk explains roughly the technical term for the benefit of his Gentile readers. Strictly speaking, 'common' (R.V. mg.) meant 'secular' or 'profane', as opposed to 'consecrated' or 'holy'. That which was 'common' was not necessarily 'impure' or 'defiled': it became so only in a context in which 'holiness' or 'consecration' was demanded (e. g. if it were a question of entering the Temple, or taking part in a solemn religious rite). The stricter Jews, who followed the Pharisaic tradition, aimed at being 'consecrated', so far as possible, at all times, and especially with a view to the partaking of food. In the market-place they might have rubbed shoulders with a Gentile, or accidentally touched something 'unclean', and so became actually 'impure': it was better, in any case, to avoid all possible risks by becoming definitely 'consecrated': and thus to all intents and purposes 'common' and 'defiled' became *for them* in practice synonymous. It is important to notice that what is at issue in this passage is not the desirability of *cleanliness* (on hygienic or

---

[1] Mt xxiii 23.

aesthetic grounds), but the question of ceremonial purity *versus* ceremonial defilement.

3–4. A general note on Jewish ritual ablutions and Pharisaic customs. It was not literally the case that these were observed by *all the Jews*: probably the Evangelist has in mind the customs of the Western Dispersion, especially at Rome, where it is possible that Pharisaic views may have prevailed. The strict Jewish horror of Gentile contamination very naturally aroused Gentile dislike, and the touch of contempt and irritation in Mk's language here reflects the anxiety of the Christian Church (in one sense the heir of Judaism) to distinguish itself with emphasis from the Synagogue.[1]

diligently (see also mg.). The word means 'with the fist', and has not been satisfactorily explained: the rendering 'diligently' is based on a Syriac version, the translator of which was probably only guessing. One important manuscript (ℵ) has 'frequently', but this is almost certainly only a conjectural emendation of a difficult text. W. C. Allen suggests that what is meant is 'some particular method of ceremonially cleansing the hands, the precise nature of which we do not know'. But it seems likely that the text is corrupt.

the tradition of the elders: unwritten traditions based on 'rulings' given by successive generations of leading Rabbis: the Pharisees regarded them as being equally binding with the written Law; the Sadducees rejected them. Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities* xiii 10, 6.

wash themselves: so the Western Text. ℵ B read 'sprinkle themselves'.

washings: lit. 'baptisms' or 'dippings': but the word had clearly come to be used for any ceremonial cleansing.

cups, and pots, and brasen vessels: lit. 'drinking cups, pint pots' (the word is a hellenized form of the Latin *sextarius* = 'the sixth part of a modius') 'and bronze vessels': the addition *and couches* (i. e. for reclining at table) is not improbably part of the true text.

On Jewish ceremonial ablutions see Schürer II ii 106–11.

6–7. *Well did Isaiah prophesy of you*, i. e. 'How absolutely the words of Isaiah apply to you!' The quotation is taken, almost, though not quite, *verbatim*, from the LXX. The fact that it is not based upon the Hebrew text, and that an accurate rendering of the Hebrew would not yield quite the same point, is a reason for thinking that it is due to the Evangelist, or to one of his sources, rather than to our Lord. The real thought is, perhaps, less of the historical opposition between the Pharisees and Jesus than of the contemporary opposition between the Synagogue and the Church. 'The quotation is applied to the Jews ('this people') and their religious observances ('vain worship') and doctrines ('precepts of men': cf. Col. ii 22)' (B. W. Bacon).

9–13. An example, derived possibly (as suggested above) from some other context and from a different source, of a current piece of rabbinical casuistry criticized by our Lord. *Full well do ye reject*: the same Greek adverb is used as in verse 6: here either ironical ('What fine behaviour it is on your part to stultify. . . !') or as a question ('Is it well done on your part to stultify . . . ?'). The Aramaic term *Corban* (= 'gift', or properly 'offering') is duly translated by Mk. The precise point at issue is not easy to grasp. (1) As usually interpreted, the passage means that a man might evade his obligations towards his parents by vowing to give to the Temple treasury (either actually, or by a legal fiction) the earnings which might otherwise have been available for their support (*That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me* = 'thy gain from me', i.e. 'thy pecuniary interest in my earnings'). (2) It seems possible that what is meant is that the son says to his father or mother, 'Rather than support you, I *would* dedicate all my earnings to the Temple', and that this *hypothetical* dedication of his property was interpreted as precluding him from using his resources for their support. (3) Strack and Billerbeck think what is meant is that the son merely explained to his parents, using a vow-formula, that what they might have hoped to receive from him was henceforward *for them* as though it had been dedicated to the Temple: the result was that it became a religious duty for the parents to renounce all usufruct of it, though the son retained it none the less. An alleged historical instance is quoted in the form of a story about a certain man of Beth-horon, who had treated his parents so, and who attempted subsequently to evade the consequences of the vow by a subterfuge which the Rabbis pronounced inadmissible. (S. & B., *op. cit.*, i, pp. 711 sqq.). As the passage now stands in the Gospel, one or other of these explanations is probably the best that can be given of it. But (4) it is known that *Corban* was a form of Jewish oath,[1] and it would appear from Mt xxiii 18 that an oath by 'the gift that is upon the altar' was regarded as being peculiarly binding. It is possible, therefore, that the saying as originally uttered by our Lord may have contemplated the case of a man who, using the solemn *Corban* oath, swears (perhaps in a fit of passion) that he will not support his parents. The case need not have been purely hypothetical; there may have been some contemporary *cause célèbre* of this description, which formed a subject of current talk in the bazaars of Galilee; and it must be presumed that one school, at least, of rabbinical casuists regarded the sanctity of the oath as overriding the obligations of filial duty.

---

[1] For Roman dislike of Jews and contempt for proselytes to Judaism see Juv. *Sat.* xiv 96–106.

The eventual decisions of Jewish Rabbinism, as codified in the

---

[1] Cf. Josephus, *c. Apion.* I 22. 'Theophrastus in his book *Concerning Laws* . . . says "The laws of the Tyrians forbid men to swear foreign oaths". Among which he enumerates certain others, and particularly that called *Corban*: which oath can only be found among the Jews.'

Mishnah, were in agreement, as Montefiore points out, with the teaching of Jesus in the matter of *Corban;* that is to say, neither oath nor vow could dispense a man from the discharge of his obligations towards his parents. The Mishnah, however, which is largely a resultant of prolonged discussions and debates between rival schools which in the time of our Lord were still going on, is no direct evidence for the views which may have been current in Palestine in the first century A. D.

14–15. The direct reply of our Lord to the question asked him in verse 5 is now given, and is represented as being addressed, not merely to the Pharisaic questioners, but to the general multitude. The scrupulosity of the Pharisees, who showed themselves so anxious to avoid even the bare possibility of ceremonial defilement, was in danger of resulting in a serious distortion of moral judgement. To avoid ceremonial pollutions arising from without was comparatively easy: to avoid the defilements of sin, which arise from within, was at once harder and much more important. The Semite, it has been pointed out, knows no comparative degree. He can only express the thought 'A is more important than B' by saying 'A matters, and B does not'.[1] So our Lord puts His thought in the form of an antithetical epigram, the primary meaning of which is simply that pollutions from within are more serious than pollutions from without. Verse 16 (= Mk iv 23) is quite possibly a genuine part of the text in both places, though R.V. relegates it here to the margin.

17–19. But when Gentile Christianity had arisen, and had once and for ever shaken off the Jewish Law, it was perceived that the saying of Jesus was capable of a deeper and more far-reaching application. It could be taken as the final abrogation both of the idea of ceremonial pollution and of the whole system of Jewish distinctions about food. The Evangelist indicates this by calling the saying a *parable* (i. e. an *enigmatic* saying, requiring explanation): and adopting the same literary device which he had employed already in iv 10 sqq., he represents the interpretation now current in the Gentile Church as having been given by the Lord in private to the disciples. The disciples originally had not completely understood the saying: they are rebuked for their blindness, and the true explanation is given. In so far as man is a moral and spiritual being, food cannot defile him: it merely passes through his body: it does not affect his 'heart'. The Evangelist himself points the moral against the Judaizers by adding the little note *so making all meats clean* (i. e. 'thus doing away with Judaic distinctions of meats'). For *draught* (i. e. latrine) the Western Text reads *bowel*: Wellhausen accepts this reading, and, straining the grammar, translates 'the bowel, which purifies all foods'; but he is probably wrong.

---

[1] Cf. the famous words of Hosea vi 6 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice', the meaning of which is simply that 'mercy' (or 'lovingkindness') is *more important* than sacrifice.

20–23. Yet a further reiteration of the point is ascribed to our Lord. The true defilement is from within, and it is from man's wicked heart that the whole gamut of vices proceeds. *The evil eye*, in a Jewish context, probably means envy, rather than the malignant power familiar in Gentile folk-lore.

24–30. *The Syrophoenician Woman*

(Cf. Mt xv 21–28)

24 And from thence he arose, and went away into the borders
of Tyre and Sidon.[1] And he entered into a house, and
25 would have no man know it: and he could not be hid. But
straightway a woman, whose little daughter had an unclean
spirit, having heard of him, came and fell down at his feet.
26 Now the woman was a Greek,[2] a Syrophoenician by race.
And she besought him that he would cast forth the devil[3]
27 out of her daughter. And he said unto her, Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's
28 bread[4] and cast it to the dogs. But she answered and saith
unto him, Yea, Lord: even the dogs under the table eat of
29 the children's crumbs. And he said unto her, For this
saying go thy way; the devil[3] is gone out of thy daughter.
30 And she went away unto her house, and found the child laid
upon the bed, and the devil[3] gone out.

---

[1] Some ancient authorities omit *and Sidon*.
[2] Or, *Gentile*.
[3] Gr. *demon*.
[4] Or, *loaf*.

Those who attempt to base upon Mk's narrative a reconstruction in chronological outline of the historical course of our Lord's ministry discover here a great turning-point in the story. The 'Galilaean ministry' is at an end; henceforward we hear of our Lord mainly upon Gentile soil—outside the dominions of Herod Antipas. There is a long journey through *the borders of Tyre and Sidon*, and a return to the Sea of Galilee, by a roundabout northern route (verse 31): if, after the feeding of the Four Thousand, a landing is made in Galilee (viii 10), opposition at once develops, and our Lord and His party embark again in a 'flight' so hurried that they 'forget to provision the boat' (viii 14, 16); from Bethsaida (viii 22) they go to the non-Jewish district of Caesarea Philippi (viii 27 sqq.); the last journey through Galilee is made *incognito* (ix 30). The motives of these various 'flights' and 'retirements' are supposed to be in part the desire of our Lord to concentrate His energies, in view of the prospect of His own arrest and coming death (now looming clearly upon the horizon), upon the task of educating the Twelve and leading them gradually towards a fuller understanding of His character and mission: in part also the urgent need to withdraw Himself from the jurisdiction of Herod, the attitude of whose government is supposed by now to have become definitely hostile (cf. vi 14–16, and notes *ad loc.*). For an ingenious study of the Gospel narrative from this particular point of view see F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 89 sqq., and cf. W. H. Cadman, *The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem*, pp. 1–56.

No doubt there is some truth in the suggestion that our Lord was at times in danger of arrest in Galilee, as well as in Jerusalem; and it is possible that His occasional journeys outside Galilaean territory may have had the quasi-political motive which Burkitt and others assign to them. But they may equally well have had the simple motive of a desire to take a rest by going outside the country for a time; it is a pure assumption that they were of long duration; and it appears to me that the theory under discussion reads far too much between the lines, and builds too confidently upon conjectures. The arrangement of Mk's materials is, in part at least, not geographical or chronological, but topical (cf. especially the group of 'conflict stories' in ii 1–iii 6); the character of his narrative throughout is such as to suggest that his materials came to him not as a continuous story, but in the form of isolated anecdotes, the arrangement of which is his own; his geography, as we have already seen, is commonly extremely vague (see especially note on vi 45); and it is at least possible that the prominence of non-Galilaean place-names in the central sections of his Gospel is relatively accidental. A few of the stories which were at his disposal were located upon Gentile soil, and he would naturally give prominence to them as being foreshadowings, in a sense, of the mission of Christianity to the outside world. It is at least possible that the effect is to give to modern readers the impression that because the journeys of Jesus outside the confines of strictly Jewish territory were thus important from the point of view of the Evangelist, they must necessarily have been of equal importance, as turning-points, in the life of Jesus. But this is a conclusion which does not follow, when once the point has been grasped that the Gospels are not (in the modern sense of the term) biographies, but presentations in narrative form (based, of course, upon authentic and broadly reliable reminiscence) of the 'Good News about Jesus Christ'.[1]

It is of interest to observe the varying attitudes of the three Synoptists towards this episode of the Syrophoenician woman. For Mk it is apparently a prophetic foreshadowing, on Pauline principles, of the mission of Christianity to the Gentiles: cf. *Let the children first be filled* (verse 27), which implies that the turn of the 'little dogs' (see below) will eventually come, with the statement in Romans about the Gospel being *the power of God unto salvation . . . to the Jew first and also to the Greek* (Rom i 16). Mt stresses the immediate narrowing of the historical mission of Jesus to His own people by the introduction of the saying, *I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel* (Mt xv 24). Lk omits the story altogether, probably as suggesting too much the inferior position of the Gentiles.

---

[1] See further, Introd., pp. xvi sqq.

The precise meaning of the story will depend, then, upon the *nuance* with which it is read. Thus among modern expositors Montefiore remarks that 'Jesus very clearly and somewhat unkindly states that His own mission is restricted to the Jews', but is subsequently 'moved' by the woman's 'humility and courage', and 'declares that her request has been granted because of her noble reply'. According to B. W. Bacon, 'the woman's answer, humble, yet full of faith, was received by Jesus as an enlargement of His own point of view. The finding of faith in this unexpected quarter was to Him an intimation from the Father (cf. Mt xvi 17), opening His eyes to a wider extension of His mission'. T. R. Glover thinks that 'the allusion to dogs has been thrown back into Jesus' words from the woman's reply, and that she was the first to mention them'.[1]

The term 'dog' was in common use among the Jews as a term of contempt applied to Gentiles: to suppose that our Lord seriously endorsed such an opprobrious usage, and that He rebuffed the woman with rudeness, would appear to be strangely out of keeping with His character. But it is to be observed that the term actually used in the text is a diminutive, and means '*little* dogs': the words are probably spoken by our Lord half whimsically, and with a smile: there was that in His manner which encouraged the woman to persist: He wanted to see what she would say if He affected to adopt the conventional Jewish point of view: and He emphatically approved the persistent courage as well as the shrewdness of her reply.

This story, and that of the centurion's servant in Mt and Lk, are remarkable as being examples of cures effected from a distance, without any actual contact between our Lord and the patient. It is noticeable that in both cases the persons so healed are apparently Gentiles. Loisy refers to a passage of S. Augustine[2] in which a symbolic significance is discovered in this fact, viz. the Gentiles will be saved by the Word, without the bodily presence of the Christ. That the Evangelist intends to narrate the story of a miracle is unquestionable. The mother returns home to find the demon already exorcised, and the patient stretched exhausted but convalescent upon the bed.

24. *The borders of Tyre and Sidon.* There is good authority for the omission of *and Sidon*; the text does not in any case imply that our Lord visited the towns in question. Their territory bordered that of Galilee both towards the W. and towards the N.; our Lord will have

---

[1] T. R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, p. 127.

[2] Aug. *Quaest. Ev.* i 18.

crossed the boundary in one or other of these directions. His fame had preceded Him, so that His whereabouts could not be concealed; and it is quite likely that He did not, in point of fact, go very far.

25. The woman was a native of the country, whose inhabitants were distinguished as Syrophoenicians, or 'Phoenicians of Syria', from the Phoenician inhabitants of Carthage in N. Africa. She is described as a Greek, probably to indicate that she was civilized and Greek-speaking. The native language was Punic, but Greek was at this period the language of civilization, and served as a 'common' language or *lingua franca* throughout the countries of the nearer East. Our Lord and His disciples spoke normally Aramaic, but it is probable that they, too, were actually bilingual, and could speak a little Greek (see notes on iii 13–19 a). In a secondary sense, however, the term 'Greek' no doubt conveyed also to the Evangelist's mind the suggestion of 'Gentile' or 'heathen' (cf. Rom i 16). The woman stands in the pages of the Gospel as the representative of the Gentile world, and the spiritual meaning of the story is correctly summed up by B. W. Bacon as the *Promise of the Children's Bread to Gentiles.*

26. There is abundant contemporary evidence that the belief in demoniacal possession was at this time widespread in the Mediterranean world, and was in no sense distinctively Jewish.

28. *Lord*: here only in Mk as a vocative addressed to Jesus.[1] The meaning in such cases need not be more than 'Sir' (cf. Mt viii 6, 8; Lk vii 6; Jn iv 11, 15, 19, &c.). On the other hand, for Mk's familiarity with the *title* 'Lord' as a designation of Jesus see notes on i 3, v 19–20, xi 3. The *crumbs* are, according to Montefiore, waste pieces of bread on which the guests, after eating, cleaned their hands, and which were thrown subsequently to the dogs. The sense seems to require a reference to domesticated dogs (is this the force of the diminutive '*little* dogs'?) rather than to the fierce *pariah* dogs of the street, which in an Oriental town play the part of scavengers by devouring refuse.

31–37. *The Deaf-mute*

(Cf. Mt xv 29–31).

31 And again he went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of
32 the borders of Decapolis. And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech; and
33 they beseech him to lay his hand upon him. And he took him aside from the multitude privately, and put his fingers
34 into his ears, and he spat, and touched his tongue; and

---

[1] Unless *Lord, if thou wilt*, &c., is to be read in i 40 (see notes *ad loc.*).

looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him,
35 Ephphatha, that is, Be opened. And his ears were opened,
and the bond of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain.
36 And he charged them that they should tell no man: but
the more he charged them, so much the more a great deal
37 they published it. And they were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well: he maketh
even the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.

The phrase *that . . . had an impediment in his speech* represents in the original an extremely rare adjective, of which the literal meaning is 'speaking with difficulty', or 'hardly able to speak'. Mk almost certainly derived it from the LXX version of Is xxxv 6, where it translates a Hebrew word meaning 'dumb'. In spite, therefore, of the fact that the literal meaning of the Gk. has influenced the turn of phrase in verse 35 (*and he spake plain*), it seems not improbable that the patient in this story is to be regarded as a deaf-mute.

The story presents many features in common with that of the Blind Man of Bethsaida (viii 22–26); material means in both cases are used to effect a cure, and the patient is taken aside from the multitude. Both are peculiar to Mk (for the Matthaean parallel here is only a generalization and not a specific anecdote), and they occupy somewhat analogous positions in relation to the two stories of the feeding of the multitudes. There is reason to think that Is xxxv may have been in the Evangelist's mind, and that he saw some symbolic appropriateness in the two stories. It has even been suggested that the comment *He hath done all things well* ascribed to the crowd in verse 37 means 'How exactly He fulfils the prophecies!' B. W. Bacon, in his analysis of the Gospel, goes so far as to designate the stories respectively 'The Ears of the Deaf Unstopped' and 'The Eyes of the Blind Opened' (cf. Is xxxv 5).

31. To go from Tyrian territory *via* Sidon to the Sea of Galilee is as though a man should travel from Cornwall to London *via* Manchester. If an actual journey is described, it certainly involved a long *détour*. On the other hand 'Tyre and Sidon', as the chief cities of Phoenicia, were readily associated together in the mind, and the probability is that Mk was not thinking very clearly of the actual geography. What he means is that our Lord left Phoenician territory and returned to the Lake; he brings Him, however, *through the midst of the borders of Decapolis* (i. e. to the *Eastern* shore of the Lake), probably because he wishes to locate in the 'Ten city' district, which was predominantly Gentile (see note on v 20), the second account of the feeding of the multitudes. Wellhausen proposes an emendation ('to Bethsaida' for *through Sidon*), which Allen accepts; but this depends on the assumption made by these two scholars that the Gospel is translated from the Aramaic.

32. The inhabitants of Decapolis when last mentioned are exhibited as hostile to our Lord (v 17). They now eagerly welcome Him, bring Him a case for healing, and in the sequel are more than ordinarily enthusiastic (verse 37).

33–35. The description is extraordinarily vivid. Probably Mk had himself seen patients treated in this way by Christians in Apostolic times who possessed the 'spiritual gift' of healing (cf. 1 Cor xii 9). Mt and Lk both omit the story, probably for the reason that they considered the manipulation of the affected organs and the use of material means like spittle to be unworthy of the Lord. Mk is closer to the popular and 'peasant' atmosphere of Galilee.

Spittle seems to have been regarded in antiquity as possessing healing properties, or at least as transmitting 'virtue' from healer to healed. Tacitus narrates how a blind man was reported to have been cured by the spittle of Vespasian at Alexandria[1] (cf. Jn ix 6). We are told that the Rabbis in later times forbade the practice on the ground of its magical associations. The Lord accompanies the application of the spittle to the patient's tongue with an upward glance to heaven (cf. vi 41 ; Jn xi 41, xvii 1), and a deep sigh, or more literally, a groan : are we to understand the latter as a 'groaning of the Spirit' in inarticulate prayer? (cf. Rom viii 23, 26). Or is it rather part of the symbolism of the story that the Lord groans by reason of human deafness to the voice of God, and consequent dumbness in respect of His praises? On the retention of the Aramaic word *Ephphatha*, accompanied by a translation, see note on v 41, and cf. vii 11, xiv 36, xv 34. The use of the word in a latinized form ('*Effeta*'), accompanied by an application of saliva to the ears and nose of the candidate, came eventually to form part of the ceremonial of Baptism according to the usage of the Western Church (the so-called *aurium apertio*). The phrase *the bond of his tongue* is of course to be understood metaphorically ; Deissmann suggests that it is a technical expression, and means that the dumbness in this patient's case was regarded as being due to the 'binding' of his tongue by a demon.[2]

36. For the injunction of secrecy cf. i 44, iii 12, v 43, viii 26.

---

[1] Tacitus, *Histories* iv 81. Cf. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur*, p. 126.

[2] Cf. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* [E.T.], pp. 306 sqq., where evidence is quoted from inscriptions and papyri for the prevalence in antiquity of the idea that a man could be 'bound' or 'fettered' by demonic influences. So here, it may be, S. Mark 'will not merely say that a dumb man was made to speak—he will add further that demonic fetters were broken, a work of Satan undone'.

CHAPTER VIII

1–9. *The second account of the feeding of the multitude*

(Cf. Mt xv 32–38)

1 In those days, when there was again a great multitude, and
they had nothing to eat, he called unto him his disciples,
2 and saith unto them, I have compassion on the multitude,
because they continue with me now three days, and have
3 nothing to eat: and if I send them away fasting to their home,
they will faint in the way; and some of them are come
4 from far. And his disciples answered him, Whence shall
one be able to fill these men with bread[1] here in a desert
5 place? And he asked them, How many loaves have ye?
6 And they said, Seven. And he commandeth the multitude
to sit down on the ground: and he took the seven loaves,
and having given thanks, he brake, and gave to his
disciples, to set before them; and they set them before the
7 multitude. And they had a few small fishes: and having
blessed them, he commanded to set these also before them.
8 And they did eat, and were filled: and they took up, of
9 broken pieces that remained over, seven baskets. And they
were about four thousand: and he sent them away.

---

[1] Gr. *loaves.*

On the reasons for thinking that this narrative is a ‘doublet’ of that given in vi 30–44, and on its probable significance in its present context (viz. Jesus the Giver of the Bread of Life to Gentiles), see above, pp. 85 sq. Many scholars discover in vi 35–vii 37 and viii 1–26 respectively two whole groups of associated ‘doublets’, thus:

A.	B.
Feeding of multitude (vi 35–44).	Feeding of multitude (viii 1–9).
Crossing of Lake (vi 45–56).	Crossing of Lake (viii 10).
Controversy with Pharisees (vii 1–23).	Controversy with Pharisees (viii 11–13).
The Children's Bread (vii 24–30).	The leaven of the Pharisees (viii 14–21).
Healing (at Bethsaida)? (vii 31–37).	Healing at Bethsaida (viii 22–26).

If there is any truth in such a suggestion, it is plausible to suppose that the Evangelist may have been combining, in this part of his Gospel, two independent but parallel *written* sources. But the parallels, except in the case of the two miracles of feeding, are not sufficiently close to be conclusive.

1. It has been supposed that the enthusiasm of the people described in vii 37 is intended by the Evangelist to provide an explanation of the presence of this great crowd which has spent *three days* in the company of Jesus and whose provisions are now exhausted. But the phrase *in those days* is vague, and the connexion with the preceding story need not be a close one.

2. The pity of Jesus in vi 34 was aroused by the spiritual destitution of the people; here it is excited by their bodily needs. The one, however, symbolizes the other, and the result is virtually the same. The disciples in vi 35 are the first to draw attention to the physical needs of the people; here Jesus takes the initiative.

4. *here in a desert place*: cf. Ex xvi 32; Jn vi 31.

5. The figures vary as between the two accounts—in vi 38 five loaves among five thousand persons, here seven loaves among four thousand.

6. 'As before, the scene is so depicted as to reflect all the features of the Church ritual' (B. W. Bacon).

7. The *few small fishes*, separately blessed, are by some critics regarded as an addition, due to assimilation of the two accounts. There is no mention in the next verse of 'fragments' of the fish, as in vi 43.

8. A different word for 'basket' (*sphuris*) is here used, as against that in vi 43 (*cophinus*). Allen, following a suggestion of Hort's, translates 'fish-baskets'. E. A. Abbott thinks there is 'an advance . . . from the Jewish *cophinus* to the Gentile *sphuris* or *sporta*'.[1] The *seven baskets* correspond with the *seven loaves*; is there a further correspondence with the *seven 'deacons'* of Acts vi 3? Dr. Abbott's remarks on the comparison and contrast of the two stories of feeding may perhaps be quoted as an example of mystical exegesis: 'As the Apostles, when ministering to the twelve tribes of Israel, received correspondently twelve *cophinoi* of fragments, so, when ministering to the Gentiles, who came from the four quarters of the world, they received seven *sphurides*, a number that would correspond to 'the seven spirits of God' and 'the seven Churches', mentioned in Revelation. The 'five loaves' of the Law were broken for the former, the 'seven loaves' of the Spirit for the latter. But the loaves were broken by one and the same Lord. The difference did not prevent the recognition of the fact that all alike, Jews and Gentiles, partook of the 'one loaf'.[2]

---

[1] E. A. Abbott, *Miscellanea Evangelica* ii, p. 142.

[2] *op. cit.*, p. 173.

10–12. *The Pharisees demand a 'sign'*

(Cf. Mt xii 38–39, xv 39, xvi 1–4; Lk xi 16, 29)

10 And straightway he entered into the boat with his disciples, and came into the parts of Dalmanutha.

11 And the Pharisees came forth, and began to question with
12 him, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him.
And he sighed deeply in his spirit, and saith, Why doth this generation seek a sign? verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation.

For attempts to identify *Dalmanutha* see Swete's note, *ad loc.* and Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, p. 22. Actually the place is quite unknown, and the text may be corrupt. Mt in the parallel passage (Mt xv 39) has 'Magadan' (also unknown, though it may be a variant of 'Magdala', a town about half-way between Capernaum and Tiberias).

That Mk was acquainted with the fuller version of the demand of the Pharisees for a 'sign' which stood in 'Q' has been argued on the ground of the occurrence in viii 38 of the phrase *adulterous and sinful generation*; here he is content to say *this generation*, though Mt xvi 4, xii 39, Lk xi 29 taken together make it probable that 'Q' contained the fuller phrase in connexion with the demand for a sign: it is, however, precisely the kind of phrase which might in various forms of the tradition of our Lord's sayings occur in more contexts than one.

For Mk *this generation* means simply the Pharisees, regarded as typical of the Jews who rejected Jesus. For these 'outsiders' the 'mystery of the Kingdom' was not intended, and to them no 'sign' shall be given. The situation is parallel to that in iv 10–12. By contrast the section which follows corresponds, in the thought of the Evangelist, to iv 13. The true 'sign' is the sign of the Broken Bread, and the disciples *ought* to have understood it.[1]

13–21. *The Mystery of the Loaves*

(Cf. Mt xvi 5–12; Lk xii 1)

13 And he left them, and again entering into *the boat* departed to the other side.

14 And they forgot to take bread; and they had not
15 in the boat with them more than one loaf. And he
charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven

---

[1] For a fuller discussion of the demand for a sign see Additional Notes, pp. 257 sq.

16 of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod. And they
reasoned one with another, saying,[1] We have no bread.[2]
17 And Jesus perceiving it saith unto them, Why reason
ye, because ye have no bread? do ye not yet perceive,
18 neither understand? have ye your heart hardened? Having
eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do
19 ye not remember? When I brake the five loaves among
the five thousand, how many baskets[3] full of broken pieces
20 took ye up? They say unto him, Twelve. And when the
seven among the four thousand, how many basketfuls[3] of
broken pieces took ye up? And they say unto him, Seven.
21 And he said unto them, Do ye not yet understand?

---

[1] Some ancient authorities read *because they had no bread.*

[2] Or, It is *because we have no bread.*

[3] *Basket* in verses 19 and 20 represents different Greek words.

A comparison with other passages in which the disciples are rebuked for their lack of spiritual insight (iv 13, vi 52, vii 18) suggests that the enigmatic words ascribed to our Lord in verses 17–21 are meant to underline some hidden meaning in the miracles of feeding, which had not been patent at the time, but which the later mind of the Church discovered in them under the guidance of the Spirit. If the interpretation suggested above is correct, this hidden meaning will be the eucharistic signification ascribed to them in early Christian thought. B. W. Bacon appears to be substantially on the right lines in grouping the two parallel cycles of episodes connected with the two feedings of the multitude under the general headings 'Sign of the Loaves in Galilee' and 'Sign of the Loaves in Decapolis'. To the unbelieving Pharisees the Lord had vouchsafed no 'sign'. The mysterious feedings were meant to be a 'sign' to those who had eyes to see, and the eucharistic mystery is a 'sign' to the faithful still. There is no need for the Church to be anxious about a shortage of spiritual 'bread': the Lord provides inexhaustibly and superabundantly for all.

The Evangelist links the sayings which subtly suggest this interpretation with a genuine saying of Jesus about *the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod* which came to him from the tradition—perhaps from 'Q^R'—and by connecting both with the 'bread-*motif*' and the lack of provisions in the boat, brings out powerfully the glaring contrast between the mind of Christ and the mind of the disciples. The Lord's mind, as He 'thinks aloud', moves wholly on the level of spiritual interpretations. The disciples prosaically misunderstand, and suppose Him to be referring to literal bread.

15. The Evangelist has already noticed that the Pharisees and the *entourage* of Herod were leagued together against Jesus (iii 6). The

saying here recorded was no doubt in its original context a warning against their hostility. Mt and Lk omit the reference to *Herod*, and Mt combines 'Sadducees' with 'Pharisees' and interprets the saying as directed against their 'teaching' (Mt xvi 12); Lk interprets *the leaven of the Pharisees* as meaning 'hypocrisy' (Lk xii 1). Abrahams notes that 'leaven' is metaphorically applied in Rabbinic thought to the evil tendencies or inclinations of man's nature, and refers to a prayer ascribed to Rabbi Alexander, viz. 'It is revealed before thee that our will is to do thy will. And what hinders? The leaven that is in the dough and servitude to the Kingdoms. May it be thy will to deliver us from their hand:' remarking that the Marcan version of our Lord's saying 'agrees strangely with the words of R. Alexander's prayer: 'the leaven that is in the dough (= the leaven of the Pharisees) and servitude to the Kingdoms (= the leaven of Herod).'[1]

17–18. The rebuke addressed to the disciples recalls the passage of Isaiah (vi 9 sqq.) already referred to in iv 11, 12; cf. also Jer v 21, Ezek xii 2.

22–26. *The Blind Man of Bethsaida*

(Mark only)

22 And they come unto Bethsaida. And they bring to him
23 a blind man, and beseech him to touch him. And he took
hold of the blind man by the hand, and brought him out of
the village; and when he had spit on his eyes, and laid his
24 hands upon him, he asked him, Seest thou aught? And he
looked up, and said, I see men; for I behold *them* as trees,
25 walking. Then again he laid his hands upon his eyes; and
he looked stedfastly, and was restored, and saw all things
26 clearly. And he sent him away to his home, saying, Do
not even enter into the village.

The Evangelist apparently thought of Bethsaida as a *village* (verses 23, 26): actually it was a considerable town. Some commentators distinguish a supposed village of 'old Bethsaida' from the new city built (or rebuilt) by the tetrarch Philip and named Bethsaida-Julias in honour of the princess Julia, daughter of the emperor Augustus. On the character of this story as in some respects a parallel to that of the deaf-mute (vii 31–37) see above. Mt and Lk omit, no doubt because the use of physical means and the apparently gradual character of the cure seemed to them unedifying. H. G. Wood remarks on the 'popular' character of the story, and Bacon points out that 'a tree-*trunk* (the part a blind man can *feel*) is in size and shape like the human figure', and that the *sense* of verse 24 is 'I can see things like walking trees'. Klostermann draws attention to a Hellenistic parallel, viz.: 'Alcetas of Halice . . . being blind saw a vision in which the god, he thought, came to him and with his fingers went over his eyes, and the first things which he saw were the trees in the temple precincts'.[1] The theory of Loisy that the gradual opening of the blind eyes symbolizes the gradual education of the disciples appears a strained attempt to discover symbolism even when it is not there. On the use of spittle see note on vii 33. There is the usual injunction of silence (verse 26). On the text of verse 26 see C. H. Turner, *The Study of the New Testament: an Inaugural Lecture*, p. 59. The probable meaning of what is most likely to be the original text is simply 'Do not tell anybody in the village!'

---

[1] Abrahams, *op. cit.* i, pp. 52–53.

A General Note on Mk viii 27–x 45

The division of the Gospel which now begins has, as most critics recognize, a distinctive character of its own. 'The section', writes J. Weiss, 'has a remarkably tense and emotional character: the key-note is sounded by the solemn and thrice-repeated predictions of the Passion, which ring out like muffled strokes of a bell. At the end (x 45) the same note is again struck, while at the same time the "ransom" saying interprets the difficult riddle. Mk is telling the story of how Jesus initiated His disciples into the necessity of His death; but inasmuch as he reproduces the teaching thrice, while yet the disciples still fail to overcome their astonishment and lack of understanding, the reader too is fain to realize that this secret counsel of God is beyond the comprehension of the merely natural man. The section further contains warning words addressed to the disciples on the necessity of bearing the Cross after Jesus, on humility, on reverence for "little ones", on renunciation. Such is the way of life which for a disciple of the Crucified must go without saying. The Marcan narrative, in fact, becomes at this point virtually an impressive sermon addressed to the reader. It enshrines in the guise of narration the kernel of a religious ethic appropriate to the martyr and missionary Church of Nero's time. Such is the general impression produced by the section as a whole'. Similarly Wellhausen: 'Here for the first time, properly speaking, begins the Gospel as it was proclaimed by the Apostles: we have seen little of it hitherto. The determination to go to Jerusalem . . . brings about a remarkable change. A transfigured Jesus stands before us . . . He no longer teaches in general terms, He makes predictions about His own Person. He speaks no longer to the people, but addresses Himself to a narrow circle of disciples, and to them He discloses His nature and vocation. He does so, moreover, esoterically: they are to say nothing to any one until the predictions are fulfilled, and until they are fulfilled the disciples do not even themselves understand His teaching. The opportunity to strip off the *incognito* which He has maintained till now is afforded by the acknowledgement of Peter "Thou art the Christ", an acknowledgement which He had Himself elicited and which He accepts, but only with an immediate correction: He is not the Messiah who is to restore the kingdom to Israel, but quite another Messiah. He goes to Jerusalem not to establish the kingdom, but to be crucified. Through suffering and death He enters into the glory of the Kingdom, and only by this same path can others enter therein. The Kingdom of God is no Jewish kingdom: it is destined only for certain chosen individuals, sc. for the disciples. The idea of the possibility of a "repentance" of the Jewish people is abandoned. Instead of the summons to repentance, addressed to everybody, we have the demand "Follow Me", which only few are capable of fulfilling. The idea of discipleship itself loses its proper significance of literal "following", and assumes a higher meaning. It no longer denotes, as hitherto, accompanying and following Jesus in His lifetime, but primarily a following of Him in His death: discipleship becomes "imitation", and as such is possible—indeed, is only in the full sense possible—after His death. It is a question of bearing the Cross after Jesus. For the Kingdom's sake disciples must make an absolute breach with family and nation, must sacrifice all that binds them to life, and life itself. . . . A breach with the world is demanded, which leads to martyrdom. Thus are the situation and mood of the earliest Christian community reflected beforehand in Jesus, as He goes forward to meet His fate. On this depends the lofty pathos in which this introduction to the Passion excels the Passion itself. The section is marked off from the rest of the Gospel even in respect of language: it is full of significant and quasi-technical terms and ideas—"the Gospel", the "Name" of Jesus (as a power in which miracles are wrought), the present and the future Age, the Kingdom of God, "glory", "life", "ransom", discipleship in the higher sense, "occasions of stumbling", "little ones which believe".'

---

[1] The Greek original—an inscription recording a cure in the temple of Asklepios at Epidaurus—is printed by Dittenberger (*Sylloge Insc. Graec.*, 3rd ed., iii, § 1168, ll. 120 sqq.

These two quotations admirably sum up the impression made by these central sections of Mk upon the Christian reader. It is not surprising that those critics who regard it as in the highest degree improbable that our Lord foresaw or predicted His Passion,[1] or those, again, who regard the conception of a *suffering* Messiah as essentially a product of subsequent Christian theology, wholly remote from the historical mind of Jesus, are disposed to see very little of genuine history in this part of Mk. Those, on the other hand, who regard the Marcan narrative as being a report, virtually at first hand, of the vividly remembered story of S. Peter, are concerned to establish, here as elsewhere, the purely historical character of every episode and the literal genuineness, down to the very details of the wording, of every saying; and further, on the assumption that the 'Petrine' authority extends not merely to the substance of Mk's narrative, but to the actual order and arrangement of the sections, to take it for granted both that the 'confession of Peter' near Caesarea Philippi marked a great crisis and turning-point in our Lord's ministry, and also that all the sayings and episodes included in the part of Mk under discussion were enacted or spoken in the course of the last great journey to Jerusalem.

---

[1] e. g. Loisy, who writes that 'Jésus n'allait pas à Jérusalem pour y mourir: il y allait pour préparer et procurer, au risque de sa vie, l'avènement de Dieu' (*Les Evangiles Synoptiques* i 214).

The view taken in this commentary is that the Evangelist's materials came to him from tradition, but that the arrangement of them was largely his own, and that the considerations which dictated it were rather expository than historical, in the narrower sense of that term. Thus in the earlier part of the Gospel a number of anecdotes were grouped together—the so-called collection of 'conflict' stories—the object of which was to illustrate the various ways in which Jesus came into conflict with the authorities (ii 1–iii 6 and notes *ad loc.*): the purpose, in other words, of the opening chapters of the Gospel would seem to have been—at least in part—to explain how it was that the authorities at Jerusalem came eventually to take action against Jesus. The purpose of these central sections would seem to be—at least in part—to establish the parallel thesis that Jesus Himself was not taken by surprise, that He saw what would happen, and moreover that the whole was part of the fore-ordained counsel of God (cf. Acts iv 28). But the Gospel was almost certainly written also for catechetical use and as a basis of preaching, and in these sections, which do in fact lead up to the Cross, the Evangelist has collected, along with predictions of the Passion, a number of sayings on renunciation, and on the nature of the Christian life as a *via crucis* for the disciple as for the Master, because this was the obviously appropriate part of the story in which to record them. The probability is that both sayings and events are in substance historical, though the impression now made by these sections as a whole is in large measure due to the manner in which they have been edited. We have seen reason already to think that the Lord saw in the fate of the Baptist a foreshadowing of what was in store for Himself (see notes on ii 18–20 and cf. Mt xvii 12); for the influence upon His mind of the Book of Isaiah, and particularly of those passages which portray the vocation of the Lord's Servant as a vocation to suffer, see Additional Notes, pp. 254 sqq. The predictions of the Passion have very likely been glossed in the light of events, and as they now stand are perhaps more explicit and detailed than when the Lord spoke them. The sayings about discipleship in like manner reflect here and there the terminology and conditions of early Church life. But just as it is likely that the Lord anticipated death for Himself, so also it is likely that He anticipated persecution for His disciples. No doubt it is true that the majority of these episodes and sayings are appropriately placed in the course of the Lord's final journey to Jerusalem: but there is no guarantee that this necessarily holds good, for example, of such anecdotes as those of ix 14–29, 33 sqq., x 2–12, 13 sqq. The first actual mention in Mk of Jerusalem as being in view occurs at x 32, though no doubt the *incognito* journey through Galilee (ix 30–32) suggests the same thing. The really elaborate working out of the conception of the last great journey as a royal progress of the Messiah towards the capital city is to be found in Lk, who alone makes the 'Exodus' at Jerusalem the subject of the conversation with Moses and Elijah at the Transfiguration (Lk ix 31), speaks of 'the fulfilment of the days of His Assumption' (Lk ix 51),[1] and (with an echo of Mal iii 1) represents the Lord, like a great King making a triumphal progress, as sending out messengers 'before His face' to prepare the way for His reception (cf. Lk ix 52, x 1).

27–33. *Caesarea Philippi*

(Cf. Mt xvi 13–23; Lk ix 18–22)

27 And Jesus went forth, and his disciples, into the villages of
Caesarea Philippi: and in the way he asked his disciples,
28 saying unto them, Who do men say that I am? And they
told him, saying, John the Baptist: and others, Elijah; but
29 others, One of the prophets. And he asked them, But who
say ye that I am? Peter answereth and saith unto him,
30 Thou art the Christ. And he charged them that they
31 should tell no man of him. And he began to teach them,
that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be
rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes,
32 and be killed, and after three days rise again. And he
spake the saying openly. And Peter took him, and began
33 to rebuke him. But he turning about, and seeing his disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind me, Satan:
for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men.

Caesarea Philippi = the modern Bânyâs = the ancient Paneas, so named from the grotto dedicated to Pan at the source of the Jordan, on the SW. slopes of the Hermon range. The place is described as

---

[1] As 'Moses' suggests the idea of the 'Exodus', so 'Elijah' suggests to Lk's mind the idea of the 'Assumption' (cf. 2 Kgs ii 9, 11 [LXX]).

'a very sanctuary of waters', a 'full-born river' thirty feet broad bursting headlong from a cavern in the face of a lofty cliff.[1] The Greek sanctuary no doubt replaced an earlier Semitic holy place, in which worship had been offered from time immemorial to the 'baal' of the subterranean waters. A temple to Augustus was dedicated in the immediate neighbourhood by Herod the Great: the city was built by his son the tetrarch Philip, who named it Caesarea after the Emperor.[2] Sir G. A. Smith remarks on the symbolic appropriateness of the locality as a setting for S. Peter's acknowledgment of the Christ—'just there and then' the disciples 'emphasized their own Master's claims upon the faith of mankind', where men 'worshipped side by side the forces of nature and the incarnation of political power'. It is noticeable, however, that Mk does not represent the Lord and His disciples as visiting the actual city of Caesarea, but only its dependent *villages*, and that the conversation with the disciples takes place *in the way*. No doubt the motive of the journey so far to the north was rest and retirement—perhaps also, as is commonly supposed, the avoidance of danger which threatened in Galilee.

It appears historically probable that the confession of Jesus' Messiahship by S. Peter at Ceasarea Philippi was the first time that the disciples' belief about their Master had been formulated and put into words: in this sense the episode no doubt marked a definite epoch. The reasons for thinking this are not primarily the narrative of Mk (who at this point has been too commonly read by critics in the light of Mt xvi 17 sqq.), but the facts (1) that the incident was remembered in the tradition and precisely located in respect of place and (2) that it seems further to have been linked already in pre-Marcan tradition with the Transfiguration, which is dated (as H. G. Wood remarks) 'with curious exactness' six days later.[3]

The significance of the story, however, *as told in this Gospel*, appears somewhat different. No stress is here laid, as in Mt, on S. Peter's confession as such, and verse 29 can be read as a simple and matter-of-fact report of the disciples' belief, precisely as verse 28 is a matter-of-fact report of the beliefs of the people at large. S. Peter, in fact, makes the confession which *of course* all disciples of the Master must make—had not the very demons repeatedly borne testimony to the supernatural character of the Christ (i 24, 34, iii 11, v 7)? The really remarkable thing is that the disciples are represented as being *rebuked*, precisely as the demons were rebuked; for the verb in verse 30, which R.V. here renders *he charged them*, is the same which occurs in i 25 and iii 12, and means properly ‘He rebuked them’ or ‘censured them’. The real point of the story for Mk is in the teaching of Jesus which follows, i. e. in the doctrine of the Cross. *And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again.* It is the contrast between the purely Judaic and the specifically Christian conception of the Messiah which for Mk forms the point of the story: the Messiahship is to be viewed only in the light of the Cross—which to the Jews, as S. Paul remarked, was a stumbling-block (1 Cor i 23). The doctrine of Messiahship, apart from the Cross, could be only misleading; and therefore Jesus *rebuked them*: they are not in that fashion to make Him known. The doctrine of the suffering destiny of the Son of Man (with its corollary, the way of the Cross for the true disciple) was the very Gospel which was to be proclaimed to all the world: and therefore the Master *spake the saying openly.*

---

[1] G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography*, p. 474.

[2] Further details in Schürer II i 132 sqq.

[3] It appears likely that the Voice from heaven in the Transfiguration story is to be interpreted, in its original meaning, as a kind of heavenly echo of the confession of Peter, a Divine utterance authenticating the conviction of the disciples about their Master; a new-found certainty of the Lord's Messiahship would form the natural psychological antecedent of such an 'audition'.

As if to clinch the matter, S. Peter is represented in turn as ‘rebuking’[1] his Master (verse 32): he is himself ‘rebuked’ (verse 33), is identified with ‘Satan’, and is told that he *thinks like a man, and not like God.*[2]

28. The verse is curiously parallel to vi 14–15. If either passage has influenced the other, it is quite likely that the present verse is primary and vi 14–15 secondary. *One of the prophets*: cf. 2 Esdras ii 18, where the return of both Jeremiah and Isaiah is anticipated.

29. Some texts add *the Son of the living God* (probably by assimilation from Mt xvi 16).

31. On *Son of man* see Introduction, pp. liii sq. *Elders, and chief priests, and scribes* together made up the Sanhedrin. *After three days*: cf. ix 31, x 34, Mt xxvii 63. Elsewhere in the N.T. we have ‘on the third day’. In popular usage the two phrases were identical in meaning, since ‘after three days’ could mean ‘when the third day had begun’. The prediction in this verse is probably in details a *vaticinium post eventum*: historically the Lord will have anticipated His passion in general terms, e. g. if He said actually *after three days* it will have been with the conventional meaning ‘after a short interval’. W. H. Cadman thinks that the ‘historic

---

[1] The verb in vv. 32, 33 is again the same which had been used in v. 30 and in i 25 and iii 12, so that S. Peter's rebuke of his Master is apparently contrasted deliberately with the Master's rebuke of the disciples—and of the demons.

[2] I owe this translation to T. R. Glover, *The Jesus of History*, p. 187. The temptation to evade the role of suffering, and to adopt some less costly conception of the Messiahship, had come to Jesus before (cf. Mt iv 10). On the assumption that the accounts of our Lord's Temptation in Mt and Lk rest ultimately on the authority of Jesus Himself, I venture to suggest that this conversation near Caesarea Philippi may have been the occasion on which our Lord communicated to the disciples in symbolic form the substance of the temptations which came to Him in the wilderness after His Baptism (cf. Mt iv 1–11; Lk iv 1–13).

nucleus' of the saying 'contained a prediction of the Passion in Jerusalem, and of the Parousia of the "Son of Man",' but not specifically of the Resurrection, which, as an event distinguishable from the Parousia, he is inclined to think can hardly have been anticipated by Jesus.[1] The argument, however, is precarious: and the belief that our Lord anticipated both the Passion and also, in some sense, the Resurrection is certainly deeply rooted in the Gospel tradition, and may well be historically based. Was our Lord influenced by Hos vi 2?

VIII. 34–IX. 1. *Sayings on true discipleship*

(Cf. Mt xvi 24–28; Lk ix 23–27; also Mt x 38, 39, 33; Lk xiv 27, xvii 33, xii 9)

34 And he called unto him the multitude with his disciples,
and said unto them, If any man would come after me, let
him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.
35 For whosoever would save his life[1] shall lose it; and
whosoever shall lose his life[1] for my sake and the gospel's
36 shall save it. For what doth it profit a man, to gain the
37 whole world, and forfeit his life?[1] For what should a man
38 give in exchange for his life?[1] For whosoever shall be
ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of
him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the
holy angels.

IX. 1 And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand *by*, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Kingdom of God come with power.

[1] Or, *soul*.

Most, if not all, of these sayings occurred, apparently, in 'Q', as the double parallels in Mt and Lk suggest. It is probable that Mk derived them from 'Q^R'. The 'Q' form of three of the sayings, preserved in the secondary Matthaean and Lucan parallels (Mt x 38, 39, 33, Lk xiv 27, xvii 33, xii 9), gives the appearance of being closer to the original as compared with the wording in Mk viii 34, 35, 38. The paragraph as it stands in Mk is so adapted as to convey to the Church of his time the much-needed lesson 'Be steadfast to endure persecution!' The contrast is between life here in this present world, in the midst of an 'adulterous' (i. e. 'idolatrous')

---

[1] Cadman, *The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem*, pp. 78 sqq.

'and sinful generation',[1] and the true life which is the reward of martyrdom. The Christian must not be ashamed to confess before men his allegiance to Christ and to His teaching, since to falter would be to bring shame to the Christ Himself, and to cast a shadow upon the glory of His triumph at the Parousia.

To this catena of sayings the Evangelist has added, probably from a different context and perhaps from a different source, a saying of Jesus of a somewhat perplexing kind (ix 1), and one which appears in fact to have caused perplexity to the early Church, as expressing, apparently, an expectation on the part of our Lord which was not literally fulfilled (see further Mk xiii 30 and notes *ad loc.*, and cf. Jn xxi 23). Why did Mk introduce the saying at this particular point? Did the Transfiguration story (which immediately follows) recall a current Jewish description of Moses and Elijah as 'the men that had been taken up, who had not *tasted death* from their birth' (2 Esdras vi 26)? And did the phrase about 'tasting death' recall in turn the saying of Jesus? Moreover, if the Gospel was written at Rome shortly after S. Peter by martyrdom had 'tasted death', it is possible that the Evangelist may have intended to suggest to his readers that the great Apostle, despite that fact, had nevertheless been witness, as it were by anticipation, of the coming glory of the Christ, when he beheld him, with James and John, on the holy mount (cf. 2 Pet i 16–18).

34. The presence of *the multitude* is incongruous here, but Mk appears hardly conscious of the incongruity. The sayings are to be understood as being addressed to the Christian public, i. e. to all readers or hearers of the Gospel. J. Weiss points out that there is a kind of word-play here, the words *follow me* meaning (1) 'be My disciple' and (2) 'follow Me on My road of suffering'. *Let him deny himself*, i. e. let him 'cease to make himself the object of his life and action'. The saying at first sight appears to presuppose 'the Cross' as being already a familiar idea, and therefore to be later than the time of Jesus: but it seems to have stood in 'Q' (cf. Mt x 38, Lk xiv 27); and the Lord may have adopted a figure from the Roman method of execution in order to express the ideas of severest suffering and ultimate risk.

35. 'The paradoxical saying about saving and losing life is found in several places in the Gospels' (see references *supra*, and cf. Jn xii 25); 'it is in a special sense the watchword of the ancient martyr Church, and in the days which followed Nero's massacre of Christians, when Mk was writing his Gospel, it must have appealed with peculiar force' (J. Weiss). The primary meaning of the saying

---

[1] The phrase *adulterous and sinful generation* occurred probably in the 'Q' form of the saying about the Pharisees who sought after a sign (Mk viii 12, cf. Mt xvi 4, xii 39, Lk xi 29): Mk here applies it to the heathen 'world' of the Roman Empire, which now was persecuting the Church. 'Adultery', by a usage which goes back ultimately to the Book of Hosea (cf. Hos ii 2, &c.), was a frequent Jewish metaphor for 'idolatry'.

is eschatological: the Christian who tries to 'save' his life now by evading martyrdom shall 'lose' it in the life to come, but he who endures martyrdom for the sake of Christ or—as Mk the missionary adds—*for the Gospel's sake* (the added words are not found in Lk xvii 33, Jn xii 25) shall gain it unto life eternal.

36. The Christian who shrinks from martyrdom does so because he values the things of this world. How foolish! For indeed it is 'the last time', and Judgement is at hand, and what profit then were the possession of all the world contains, at the cost of the loss of 'life' hereafter?

37. No price can deliver or buy back from death a life that in the deeper sense is 'lost' (cf. Ps xlix 8).

38. The 'Q' form of this saying appears to have been 'whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven' (Mt x 33, cf. Lk xii 9). Mk stresses the eschatology by introducing the more specific reference to the coming of the Son of Man. The argument of some scholars who have urged, on the ground of the Marcan form of the saying, that our Lord, so far from identifying Himself with the Son of Man, expressly distinguishes between Himself and that future Figure of Jewish apocalyptic expectation, falls to the ground when it is realized that the form in 'Q' is in all probability the more original.

IX. 1. The words of this verse, as they stand in Mk, might be taken, on a minimizing view, to mean no more than that Jesus Himself would be put to death, but that His disciples would live to witness a signal vindication of His cause by the power of God, such as might be regarded as being in some sense a genuine 'coming' of *the Kingdom of God with power.* It seems more probable, however, that the saying is correctly glossed in Mt xvi 28, and that the real reference is, as elsewhere, to the expected 'Parousia' or 'Coming' of the Son of Man.

CHAPTER IX

2–8. *The Transfiguration*

(Cf. Mt xvii 1–8; Lk ix 28–36)

2 after six days Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James,
and John, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart
by themselves: and he was transfigured before them: and
3 his garments became glistering, exceeding white; so as no
4 fuller on earth can whiten them. And there appeared unto
them Elijah with Moses: and they were talking with Jesus.
5 And Peter answereth and saith to Jesus, Rabbi, it is good

for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles;[1] one
6 for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah. For he
7 wist not what to answer; for they became sore afraid. And
there came a cloud overshadowing them: and there came
a voice out of the cloud, This is my beloved Son: hear ye
8 him. And suddenly looking round about, they saw no one
any more, save Jesus only with themselves.

[1] Or, *booths.*

The story of the Transfiguration, in which it is clear that the earliest Church saw a high evidential value, and which to Mk is of deep significance because it enshrined, or appeared to enshrine, like the story of the Baptism, the direct supernatural testimony of God Himself to the truth of Christ, is to-day very commonly rejected as mythical, and regarded as being, either wholly or mainly, a product of Christian fantasy. It must be confessed that it looks at first sight like a piece of symbolical writing after the manner of that 'apocalyptic' literature of late Judaism and early Christianity, of which the Book of Daniel is one of the earliest important examples, and the Book of Revelation one of the latest. On such a view it would be the expression, in the form of a symbolical vision purporting to have been granted in advance to chosen witnesses, but forbidden to be made known until after the event (ix 9, cf. Dan xii 4, 9), of the faith of the Church as it came to be developed in the Apostolic age in the light of the Resurrection. Wellhausen, Loisy, and others accordingly regard the story as having been based on a post-resurrection appearance of the Christ to S. Peter[1] (cf. 1 Cor xv 5), which has been recast in the interests of symbolism and antedated. Moses and Elijah appear as the two 'witnesses' of the Messiah in the Apocalypse of S. John.[2] In the Transfiguration story they appear also as the symbolic representatives of Law and Prophecy respectively, bearing witness to the Christ in whom both alike are regarded as being fulfilled. The Divine Voice bids the disciples from henceforth to 'hearken' to Jesus (verse 7), i.e. no longer to pay heed merely to Moses and the Prophets. The figures of Elijah and Moses disappear (verse 8), thereby symbolizing that the *régime* of Law and Prophecy has been superseded by the manifestation of the *Beloved Son* of God. On the difficulties of prosaic commentators Loisy remarks, 'Poor commentators, who are so anxious to find out whether you are on Mt. Tabor or on Mt. Hermon, and whence came Moses and Elijah, and how they have managed to make themselves visible, and how the disciples can have recognized them without having ever seen them before, listen to the conversation of Sinai with Calvary, and take care that you do not intrude, for fear lest your reflections should resemble the saying of Peter, of which the Evangelists have justly remarked that it had no meaning.'[1]

---

[1] Wellhausen thinks to Peter and James and John. It is worth noting that the Transfiguration is apparently placed after the Resurrection in the recently discovered fragment of the *Gospel* (*or Apocalypse?*) *of Peter*. Cf. Clem. Alex. *apud* Euseb. *H.E.* II i 4. The text of the fragment is printed in Preuschen, *Antilegomena* (2nd edit.), pp. 84 sqq., E.T. in M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 505 sqq.

[2] Rev. xi 3-11: the power to turn water into blood and to smite the earth with every kind of plague points to Moses; the power to destroy their enemies with fire and to prevent rain points to Elijah. It was supposed that neither of them had 'tasted death' (2 Esdras vi 26): for the assumption of Elijah cf. 2 Kgs ii 11; the tradition with regard to Moses is embodied in the apocryphal *Assumption of Moses*. Their return before the end of the world appears to have been expected amongst the Christians, and the return of Elijah among the Jews. A late Jewish writing records that according to Rabbi Jochanan ben Zakkai (1st cent. A.D.), God said to Moses, 'If I send the prophet Elijah, ye must both come together'. According to yet another tradition the two 'witnesses' of the Messiah were expected to be Elijah and Enoch (cf. 1 Enoch xc 31; Tertullian,

The above view is in some respects tempting: and it may be allowed that a symbolical meaning was early read into the story, and has possibly affected its form as it stands in the Gospels. On the other hand, it seems likely that there may have been a basis of genuinely historic reminiscence as well. The remark of S. Peter (verse 5) is precisely the kind of remark—half-related to the supposed situation, semi-reasonable, and yet fundamentally foolish—which might be made by a man in a dream, or in the strange, half-hypnotic condition in which men see visions (and hear voices). The psychology of such experiences is to-day being seriously studied, and enough is known about them to justify abundantly the remark of Miss Evelyn Underhill that 'in the present state of the evidence, a definite rejection of these narratives is as unscientific as the most pious credulity'.[2] On the assumption that the three disciples[3] were in fact the subjects of what in the language of modern psychology would no doubt be classed as a species of 'visual and auditory hallucination', it may be pointed out that the form and perceptual content of such experiences, however vivid and real to their percipients, is normally determined by the conscious or subconscious beliefs or expectations of those who experience them. From this point of view it would be as intelligible that a Jewish peasant, or a group of Jewish peasants, should see Moses and Elijah, or should seem to themselves to be the recipients of a *Bath-Qol*,[4] as that the French peasant-girl Bernadotte should see the vision of the Madonna in the famous grotto at Lourdes, or that S. Francis, after prolonged meditation upon the Passion,

---

De Anima, 50; Bousset, *Der Antichrist*, p. 134 sqq.). Further references in R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of S. John* i 281 sqq., and Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums* (2nd ed.), pp. 267, 300.

[1] *Les Evangiles Synoptiques* ii 34.

[2] Evelyn Underhill, *The Mystic Way*, p. 116.

[3] Or perhaps primarily S. Peter?

[4] See notes (pp. 9 11 *supra*) on the *Bath-Qol* at our Lord's Baptism.

should experience the stigmata, or that S. Antony, wrestling in solitude with temptation, should see visions of the devil, or a modern Quaker become conscious of a 'leading' or an 'opening' from the Lord. It may be added that such a psychological interpretation of the phenomena does not at all preclude the view that such experiences, however subjectively determined as regards their form and perceptual content, may yet have been the vehicles, in particular cases, of genuinely spiritual intimations from on high.[1] For an interesting study of the Transfiguration along these lines see Miss Evelyn Underhill, *The Mystic Way*, pp. 114–123, where examples are also given of a luminous glory appearing to have transfigured the faces of saints in ecstatic prayer. It appears to have been assumed by Lk that our Lord's primary purpose in ascending the mountain was to pray (cf. Lk ix 28).[2]

2. *Peter, and James, and John*: cf. v 37, xiv 33.

Was transfigured: the somewhat rare verb which Mk uses here was in Hellenistic Greek almost technical for magical metamorphoses (e. g. it is used by Lucian of a sorceress transforming herself into a bird). Lk omits it, perhaps on the ground of its association with magical processes. On the other hand, it is used by S. Paul of the 'transformation' of the believer into the spiritual likeness of Christ (Rom xii 2, 2 Cor iii 18). Some commentators believe that Mk has in mind in this passage the 'glorified' Christ of the Resurrection, and that he means to suggest that just as Jesus had initiated the disciples into the mystery of His coming Passion, so also it was made clear by a special revelation to the chosen three that despite His sufferings He was truly the Son of God, and that 'the Son of Man would rise again from the dead' (so e. g. J. Weiss).

3. *So as no fuller on earth can whiten them*: Mt and Lk characteristically omit this homely touch.

4. *And they were talking with Jesus.* Lk alone suggests that the subject of the conversation was the coming Passion.

---

[1] God speaks to the souls of men, when He does speak to them, not in the language of heaven, but in the language of earth—in such language, indeed, as the recipients of His revelation may best be able to understand. It is God who speaks: but the criterion of revelation is not in its form, nor does psychological abnormality or strangeness guarantee a supposed revelation as being divine. As the old mystics were accustomed to put it, a vision might proceed either from God or from the devil, and only a spiritual judgement could rightly assess its worth (cf. 1 Cor ii 14).

[2] It is to be observed, however, that Mk does not emphasize our Lord's transfigured face, but the unearthly whiteness of His clothes. On the phenomenon of *photisms* or pseudo-hallucinatory sensations of bright light, by which natural objects occasionally appear transfigured, see James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, pp. 251 sqq., where the subject of a dramatic religious conversion is quoted as describing how when he went in the morning into the fields to work, 'the glory of God appeared in all His visible creation. I well remember how we reaped oats, and how every straw and head of the oats *seemed, as it were, arrayed in a kind of rainbow glory, or to glow, if I may so express it, in the glory of God*' (italics mine).

5. *It is good for us to be here*: translate rather 'It is a good thing that we are here'—otherwise there would be no one to do honour to the strange visitants from the other world by providing shelter for them and for the Master. On the curious character of the remark see above.

6. For the terror of the disciples in presence of the supernatural cf. iv 41, vi 49–50.

7. The *cloud* is the *Shechinah* symbolizing the Divine Glory (cf. Ex xvi 10, xix 9, 16, xxiv 15 sqq., and also 1 Kgs viii 10; and see Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp. 217–220). In the Messianic period the *Shechinah* was to reappear (2 Macc ii 8). Probably it is here to be regarded as overshadowing Jesus, Moses, and Elijah, rather than the three disciples. The utterance of the Divine Voice should possibly be punctuated *This is my Son, the Beloved* (see notes on i 11). *Hear ye Him* is possibly a reference back to Dt xviii 15—i. e. 'the Beloved' is also the 'Prophet' foretold by Moses (so W. C. Allen).

9–13. *A difficulty about Elijah*

(Cf. Mt xvii 9–13)

9 And as they were coming down from the mountain, he
charged them that they should tell no man what things
they had seen, save when the Son of man should have risen
10 again from the dead. And they kept the saying, question-
ing among themselves what the rising again from the
11 dead should mean. And they asked him, saying,[1] The
12 scribes say that Elijah must first come. And he said unto
them, Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things:
and how is it written of the Son of man, that he should
13 suffer many things and be set at nought? But I say unto
you, that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him
whatsoever they listed, even as it is written of him.

[1] Or, How is it *that the scribes say . . . come?*

This objection of the scribes against Christianity was still being urged by Jewish opponents when Justin Martyr wrote his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew.*[1] Probably on the ground that Elijah had just been mentioned as appearing with Moses at the Transfiguration, Mk introduces at this point the Christian answer to the difficulty, viz. that John the Baptist is to be understood as Elijah (cf. Mt xi 14), and if he did not, in any full sense, *restore all things* (verse 12, cf. Mal iv 4–6), the reason is that men did to him *whatsoever they listed*

---

[1] Cf. Justin, *Dialog.* 49.

(verse 13). The clue to the whole problem is a proper understanding of the Scriptures (cf. 1 Kgs xix 2, 10, the new Jezebel, however, who was Herod's Queen, having been more successful than the old. Or is there an implied reference to some apocryphal 'scripture', such as perhaps underlies Rev xi 6 sqq.?); a suffering and dying Elijah corresponds to a suffering and dying Christ (cf. Is liii).

The broad meaning of this paragraph, then, is not obscure, and there is no reason to doubt that the main point, viz. the identification of the Baptist with Elijah, goes back to and rests upon an authentic saying of our Lord. There is great difficulty, however, about the detailed exegesis of the verses as they now stand in the text. Wellhausen, who points out that the force of the argument implied in verse 11 is that if Elijah is first to make all things ready for the Messiah, how is it intelligible that a people thus *ex hypothesi* prepared for His Coming should reject Him and put Him to death, maintains that verse 12 must be taken interrogatively, as a *rejection* of the interpretation of the Scribes, *sc.* 'Elijah, you say, must first come and restore all things. But how then about the prophecies of the Passion? As a matter of fact, I tell you Elijah is already come, &c.' If this view be not accepted, the best solution is probably to follow C. H. Turner in assuming a dislocation in the text and transposing the second half of verse 12 so as to make it follow verse 10. The passage will then run as follows: *And they kept the saying, questioning among themselves what the rising again from the dead should mean, and how it was written of the Son of man that he should suffer many things and be set at nought. And they asked him, saying,*[1] *How is it that the scribes say that Elijah must first come? And he said unto them, Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things. But I say unto you, that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed, even as it is written of him.*[2]

9. On the view that the story of the Transfiguration has a basis of some kind in actual history, the injunction of silence here is to be explained on the lines of whatever general theory covers the injunctions of silence in this Gospel as a whole (see Additional Notes, pp. 258 sqq.). Those, on the other hand, who regard the account of the Transfiguration as being wholly a product of later theology, discover here the Evangelist's explanation of what must be presumed to have been the notorious fact that prior to the Resurrection the Transfiguration story was unknown.

10. *And they kept the saying* probably means that they obeyed the injunction to keep silent, rather than that they kept hold of and remembered the saying about the Resurrection. The Gk., however, is difficult, and it has been suggested that a negative may have fallen out of the text;[3] in which case translate, 'But they understood not the saying, and questioned', &c.

---

[1] R.V. mg. which Turner prefers.

[2] C. H. Turner, *The Study of the New Testament*, p. 61.

[3] A. Pallis, *A few Notes on the Gospels, &c.*, p. 16.

14–29. *The Epileptic Boy*

(Cf. Mt xvii 14–21; Lk. ix 37–43 a)

14 And when they came to the disciples, they saw a great
multitude about them, and scribes questioning with them.
15 And straightway all the multitude, when they saw him,
16 were greatly amazed, and running to him saluted him. And
17 he asked them, What question ye with them? And one
of the multitude answered him, Master,[1] I brought unto
18 thee my son, which hath a dumb spirit; and wheresoever
it taketh him, it dasheth him down:[2] and he foameth,
and grindeth his teeth, and pineth away: and I spake to
thy disciples that they should cast it out; and they were
19 not able. And he answereth them and saith, O faithless
generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall
20 I bear with you? bring him unto me. And they brought
him unto him: and when he saw him, straightway the
spirit tare[3] him grievously; and he fell on the ground,
21 and wallowed foaming. And he asked his father, How
long time is it since this hath come unto him? And he
22 said, From a child. And oft-times it hath cast him both
into the fire and into the waters, to destroy him: but if
thou canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help
23 us. And Jesus said unto him, If thou canst! All things
24 are possible to him that believeth. Straightway the father
of the child cried out, and said,[4] I believe; help thou
25 mine unbelief. And when Jesus saw that a multitude
came running together, he rebuked the unclean spirit,
saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I command
26 thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him. And
having cried out, and torn[3] him much, he came out: and
the child became as one dead; insomuch that the more part
27 said, He is dead. But Jesus took him by the hand, and
28 raised him up; and he arose. And when he was come into
the house, his disciples asked him privately, *saying*,[5] We

---

[1] Or, *Teacher.*
[2] Or, *rendeth him.*
[3] Or, *convulsed.*
[4] Many ancient authorities add *with tears.*
[5] Or, How is it *that we could not cast it out?*

29 could not cast it out. And he said unto them, This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer.[1]

[1] Many ancient authorities add *and fasting.*

The opening words of this section have caused perplexity to commentators. The reading varies in verse 14, some MSS. having *and when he came . . . he saw.* The ordinary reading fits better the Marcan context, since it is a case of the Lord and the three disciples rejoining the rest of the company: *the disciples* in verse 14 means presumably the *other* disciples. The dispute with the *scribes* may be interpreted —reading between the lines—as a dispute about the proper methods of exorcism, but the scribes are not mentioned in the rest of the story. Moreover, the astonishment of the crowd at the sight of Jesus is difficult to explain—was it simply because He arrived opportunely but unexpectedly? Some commentators compare the lingering glory on the face of Moses (Ex xxxiv 29), and suppose that the crowd were astonished to observe a radiance still on the face of Jesus: but this seems quite contrary to the intention of Mk ix 9. Bacon says roundly that 'for the bringing of the epileptic, the disputing scribes, the surrounding multitude, and especially the "great amazement" of the latter, the present connexion affords no explanation'. It seems, in fact, not improbable that, here as elsewhere, the arrangement of the episodes is due to Mk, who attached this story to that of the Transfiguration because it presupposed, in the form in which it came to him, an absence of Jesus from the disciples, such as the Transfiguration setting provided for it. On this view the dramatic contrast, immortalized by the art of Raphael, between the ideal beauty of the holy vision granted to the three disciples upon the mountain, and the piteous spectacle below of the epileptic boy and the disputing crowd, is due in the first instance to our Evangelist.

It is noticeable that the parallel versions of this episode in Mt and Lk are both much shorter than that of Mk, and further that they agree closely as regards the particular verses of Mk which they omit: a fact which has led some critics to think that Mt and Lk are here dependent upon some common source other than Mk which they preferred to the Marcan version, and from which the Marcan version itself may possibly by expansion be derived. This seems a very complicated hypothesis, as an alternative to which it would rather be tempting to fall back upon the theory of an *Urmarcus* or 'Original Mk', subsequently expanded, here and in other places, at a date later than that at which Mt and Lk were compiled: but against this is the fact that the verses thus assumed to have been added later (viz. 14 b, 15–16, 21–24, 25 b, 26 b, 29), with their vivid description of symptoms and animated dialogue, have all the look of originality.

The case, as the description as a whole makes quite clear, was one of epilepsy: the recurrent convulsions and fits to which the patient was subject being ascribed, however, in accordance with the ideas of the time, to the periodical attacks of a demon. Mk alone makes the boy's father in verse 17 describe the latter as *a dumb spirit* or 'a spirit who refuses to speak', and our Lord, in proceeding to the exorcism (verse 25), addresses the demon as *Thou dumb and deaf spirit.* Loisy and others think that Mk has artificially converted a case of epilepsy into one of deafness and dumbness, in order to make the boy symbolize 'humanity delivered from spiritual deafness and rendered capable of praising the God revealed by Christ'; but this seems far-fetched. A temporary *aphasia* or inability to speak, together with apparent insensibility on the part of the patient to any words that may be addressed to him, are of course among the characteristic symptoms of an epileptic when suffering from a fit.

18. Gould translates 'whenever it seizes him, it convulses him, and he foams and gnashes his teeth; and he is wasting away'. It is possible, however, that the word which R.V. renders *pineth away* should be translated 'he becomes rigid'.

19. *Faithless* in the sense of 'unbelieving'. Some commentators think the reproach of Jesus is addressed specifically to the disciples, who are blamed for the lack of faith which had prevented them from dealing successfully with the case before Jesus arrived. But the words seem rather to be the expression of weariness in view of the lack of faith manifested by 'that generation' in general—the scribes, the multitude, the disciples, and the contemporaries of Jesus as a whole. The Lord is regarded, throughout this whole division of S. Mk, as being dedicated henceforward unto death. 'The expectation of the end . . . prompts or colours the exclamation' (H. G. Wood).

20. The probable meaning is that when the 'spirit' saw Jesus, it promptly threw the boy into a convulsion.

22. We are not to think of suicidal mania: the fits come on suddenly, and it has often happened that the patient has fallen into the fire or into the water, to the imminent peril of his life, and these occurrences are naïvely ascribed to the malignity of the demon, who is supposed to have been attempting to destroy his victim.

23. R.V. rightly translates the Gk. *All things are possible to him that believeth* means probably *not* that 'faith can do anything', but that one who has faith will set no limits to the power of God.

24. The addition *with tears* is not impossibly part of the true text. *I believe: help thou mine unbelief* means probably 'I *have* faith in God's power: but help me out of my trouble, even though my faith be inadequate and weak'.

25. There seems some inconsequence in this fresh arrival of the multitude. Probably all that is meant is that the crowd round the little group was continually increasing.

The Lord pronounces a solemn exorcism: the personal pronoun in the Gk. is emphatic (*sc.* 'It is *I* who command thee'): the demon's characteristics are adopted as a form of address (in default of his 'name'? cf. notes on v 9); and since the boy's affliction was of a kind which involved not continuous suffering, but periodical or recurrent fits, the demon is not merely enjoined to depart on the present occasion, but is forbidden to return.

26. For the final paroxysm attending the demon's departure cf. i 26 and notes on v 7.

27. The description here recalls the case of Jairus' daughter (v 41).

28–29. Mt xvii 20 gives a different answer to the disciples' question, to which in some texts a version of Mk ix 29 is added as a further comment. It seems likely that here, as elsewhere, the esoteric conversation with the disciples reflects the experience of the early Church; in which case the words *and fasting* are probably a genuine part of the Marcan text. The Church, it would seem, ascribed cases of failure to exorcize demons successfully to spiritual deficiencies on the part of the exorcist; and there were certain types of demon who would yield only to an exorcist who was conspicuously an ascetic and a man of prayer.

30–32. *A second prediction of the Passion*

(Cf. Mt xvii 22–23; Lk ix 43 b–45)

30 And they went forth from thence, and passed through
Galilee; and he would not that any man should know it.
31 For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son
of man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they
shall kill him; and when he is killed, after three days he
32 shall rise again. But they understood not the saying, and
were afraid to ask him.

Mk probably thinks of the journey to Jerusalem as beginning at this point, though the city is not actually mentioned until x 32. The statement that the Lord sought to maintain an *incognito* while passing through Galilee, if based on a true historical recollection, implies probably that there was danger to be apprehended from the side of the Herodian Government. Mk assigns as a motive for the secrecy the Lord's desire to give esoteric instruction to the disciples about the Passion, which they fail to understand. See on this the Additional Note on the injunctions of secrecy in the Gospel, pp. 258 sqq. On the predictions of the Passion generally see pp. 108–111. The statement that the Son of Man is delivered up may imply in the thought of the Evangelist the idea of the Father 'delivering up' the Son in the sense of Rom viii 32.

33–37. *The true greatness*

(Cf. Mt xviii 1–5; Lk ix 46–48: also Mk x 15, 43, 44; Mt x 40, xx 26, 27, xxiii 11, 12; Lk x 16, xviii 14, 17, xxii 26).

33 And they came to Capernaum: and when he was in the house he asked them, What were ye reasoning in the way?
34 But they held their peace: for they had disputed one with
35 another in the way, who *was* the greatest.[1] And he sat down, and called the twelve; and he saith unto them, If any man would be first, he shall be last of all, and minister
36 of all. And he took a little child, and set him in the midst
37 of them: and taking him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.

[1] Gr. *greater.*

The remainder of this chapter (ix 33–50) consists of a catena of sayings of Jesus, the majority of which appear to have stood in 'Q': they appear in various forms and in different contexts in the Gospels, and it is probable that some of the sayings and episodes may be 'doublets' of one another. The present Marcan catena is an excellent example of the way in which disconnected sayings of Jesus were linked together, as an aid to the memory, not by connexion of thought, but by connecting links of a purely *verbal* kind: thus the idea of being *minister of all* (verse 35) recalls that of 'receiving little ones' (verse 37): the phrase *in my name* (verse 37) recalls *in thy name* (verse 38) and *because ye are Christ's* (lit. 'in the name that ye are Christ's') in verse 41; verses 42, 43 are linked together by the idea of 'causing to stumble'; the reference to *fire* is the only link of connexion between verses 48 and 49, and the idea of *salt* connects verse 49 with verse 50, and perhaps also the two halves of verse 50 with one another.

33. *Capernaum*: here mentioned for the last time in Mk. For *the house* cf. note on ii 1.

34. The disciples are abashed at the discovery that Jesus had overheard their conversation, the subject of which was probably a dispute about rank and precedence in the future Kingdom (so Mt xviii 1 rightly glosses the verse). The Gk. has literally 'Who was greater' (R.V. mg.), but the comparative in Hellenistic Gk. often fulfils the function of a superlative.

35. *He sat down.* Some commentators explain that the Lord sits, because that was the posture of a teacher, and He wishes to teach

solemnly an important lesson; others less probably, that He sits as a judge pronouncing sentence. But the most obvious suggestion is that He sat down to rest after His journey. The calling of *the twelve* is strange, and looks like a new beginning, but it is not necessary with E. Meyer to think of a contamination of sources.[1] No doubt there may have been others besides the 'twelve' in the 'house', and the Lord, having sat down, calls the little group around Him. The words *If any man would be first, &c.*, should not be interpreted as a threat of what will happen at the Judgement to those who have displayed the temper of ambition, but as an indication of how really to become great, and of the essence of true greatness, viz. that it consists in service (cf. x 43–44). J. Weiss thinks that the saying is directed against the Twelve, and shows a certain animus against them on the part of the Evangelist, and Loisy holds similarly that the *child* of verses 36, 37, who is to be received in the name of Christ, is an apostle, 'the envoy of Christ, as Christ is the envoy of God', and that the point of the whole passage as it stands in Mk is to rebuke the self-assertion of the original Twelve over against the claims of S. Paul (cf. 1 Cor xv 9–11). Lagrange, however, appears thoroughly justified in remarking that it is 'useless to discuss this chimera'.

36. For the Lord's love of children cf. x 13–16. Mk alone states in both passages that He 'took them in His arms'. It is idle to speculate as to the identity of the child here: Swete plays with the suggestion that it was a child of S. Peter's: a late tradition, misplacing the accent on the name *Theophorus* borne by S. Ignatius of Antioch and interpreting it as meaning 'carried by God' instead of 'bearer of God', asserted that Ignatius was the child of this story.

37. A comparison of Mt x 40–42 Lk x 16 suggests that this saying, or something like it, stood in 'Q' as the conclusion of the 'missionary' discourse, and that the original meaning was that the missionaries of the Gospel were to be received as Jesus Himself, for they were sent by Him, as He was sent by God. Mk, by adapting the saying here so as to form the comment on the action of Jesus in taking the little child into His arms, imports into it a more mystical significance, viz. whoever receives a little child and shows him kindness 'on the ground of the name' of Jesus, is ministering to Christ in ministering to His members, and in honouring Christ is honouring the God who sent Him. It is possible to take *in My name* here as meaning simply 'for My sake', but it more probably means 'on the ground of My name', i. e. 'because of his connexion with Me', or not impossibly 'because My Name has been invoked over him' in

---

[1] E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* i 139 sqq. Meyer distinguishes throughout a large part of Mk's narrative a source in which our Lord's followers are spoken of as 'the disciples' from a source in which they are spoken of as 'the twelve', and thinks that v. 35 is one of the points at which the two sources join.

Baptism.[1] How early, as a matter of history, the practice of infant Baptism began in the Christian Church is quite uncertain: the analogy of the admission of infants by circumcision into the Covenant of Israel suggests that it may have begun even in Apostolic times: the child here who is to be received in Christ's name is almost certainly to be regarded as standing within the Christian community, though it is possible that we are to think less of a literal child than of a humble and typically insignificant member of the Christian family, one of the *little ones that believe* (verse 42). The saying as it stands in Mk has an almost Johannine ring, which, however, appears to be due to the Marcan use of it rather than to the original form of the saying as uttered by Jesus.

38–40. *The Exorcist who was not a Disciple*

(Cf. Lk ix 49–50)

38 John said unto him, Master,[1] we saw one casting out devils [2]
in thy name: and we forbade him, because he followed not
39 us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man
which shall do a mighty work [3] in my name, and be able
40 quickly to speak evil of me. For he that is not against us
is for us.

[1] Or, *Teacher*. [2] Gr. *demons*. [3] Gr. *power*.

The practice of exorcism—a natural correlative of the belief in demons—was widespread in the Hellenistic period both among Jews and Gentiles, and often degenerated into a form of magic, in which everything turned upon the use of the appropriate 'Name' of power. The magical papyri, great numbers of which have been found in Egypt, make it evident that names derived from Judaism—e. g. Jahveh Sabaoth, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and various names of Jewish angels and archangels—were in frequent use among non-Jewish magicians for such purposes: and among such heathen formulae of magic the Name of Jesus also occasionally occurs.[2] The present story presupposes such a magical or quasi-magical use of the Name of Jesus for the purpose of exorcism, by one who was not himself a follower of the Master, even in His lifetime—a by no means impossible supposition. In Apostolic times certainly the question of the right attitude for the Church to take up towards non-

---

[1] Cf. Jas ii 7, where instead of *the honourable name by which ye are called* translate 'the honourable Name which was invoked upon you' (cf. R.V. mg.).

[2] Reitzenstein quotes from a papyrus the formula 'I adjure thee by Jesus the God of the Hebrews'—based evidently upon a very external acquaintance with Christianity on the part of the magician who made use of it (*Poimandres*, p. 14 n.).

Christian exorcists who made use of the Name of Jesus was an urgent one (cf. Acts xix 13 sqq.). The problem is here solved by drawing attention to a traditional saying of Jesus Himself upon the subject. There is no reason why the saying recorded here and that of Mt xii 30 should not both alike be genuine in different contexts. The theory of Loisy and others that the strange exorcist here is meant to typify S. Paul is too fantastic to deserve serious consideration.

41–50. *A further catena of sayings*

(Cf. Mt x 42, xviii 6–9, v 13 ; Lk xvii 1–2, xiv 34–35)

41 For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink,
because[1] ye are Christ's, verily I say unto you, he shall in
42 no wise lose his reward. And whosoever shall cause one of
these little ones that believe on me[2] to stumble, it were
better for him if a great[3] millstone were hanged about his
43 neck, and he were cast into the sea. And if thy hand
cause thee to stumble, cut it off: it is good for thee to enter
into life maimed, rather than having thy two hands to go
45 into hell,[4] into the unquenchable fire.[5] And if thy foot
cause thee to stumble, cut it off: it is good for thee to enter
into life halt, rather than having thy two feet to be cast
47 into hell.[4] And if thine eye cause thee to stumble, cast it
out: it is good for thee to enter into the kingdom of God
with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into
48 hell;[4] where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not
49 quenched. For every one shall be salted with fire.[6]
50 Salt is good: but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith
will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and be at
peace one with another.

---

[1] Gr. *in the name that ye are.*

[2] Many ancient authorities omit *on me.*

[3] Gr. *a millstone turned by an ass.*

[4] Gr. *Gehenna.*

[5] Verses 44 and 46 (which are identical with ver. 48) are omitted by the best ancient authorities.

[6] Many ancient authorities add *and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.* See Lev ii 13.

41. In Mt this saying finds a more appropriate context in the discourse on the sending out of the Twelve (Mt x 42). The only link of connexion here with what went before is the reference to

'the Name' (R.V. mg.). The meaning of the saying is that the smallest act of kindness shown to a disciple on the ground of his connexion with the Christ shall be sure of reward in the Day of Judgement, a thought which is further developed in the parable of the sheep and the goats (Mt xxv 31 sqq.). Lagrange notes that the phraseology *because ye are Christ's* is Pauline (cf. Rom viii 9, 1 Cor i 12, iii 23, 2 Cor x 7). Nowhere else is the word *Christ* used in the Synoptic Gospels or in the Acts as a proper name without the article. Hawkins suggests that the phrase may be due to a later editor's hand:[1] but it may equally well be the gloss of some early copyist. Mt x 42 is probably in any case the more original form of the saying. For Loisy the person giving a cup of water to the disciples on the ground of their connexion with the Messiah is S. Paul bringing Gentile alms to the saints at Jerusalem (!).

42. *Cause . . . to stumble*: on the meaning of the verb so translated see note on iv 17. Here it appears to mean 'lead into sin' or 'lead astray'. Possibly if W. C. Allen's translation 'ensnare' were accepted, we might compare a remark of Schürer's that 'the zeal of the scribes was continually increasing the number of snares, by which an Israelite who was a strict adherent of the Law might incur uncleanness through heathen practices'.[2] But Lk has the saying without the words *that believe in me* (Lk xvii 1–2), and the two words *in me* are doubtful in the Marcan text: so that the original form of the saying may have emphasized the reverence due to children and the sin of leading those who were literally *little ones* astray. Mk is thinking of the grievousness of the sin incurred by those who lead simple Christians astray by shaking wantonly their faith. A man had better be drowned before committing such a sin.

43–48. With extreme energy of vivid metaphor and with a threefold iteration the Lord here urges men to make the costliest sacrifices, if need be, in order to avoid sin and to enter into '*life*'—the equivalent in verses 43, 45 of *the kingdom of God* in verse 47. Occasions of sin at whatever cost are to be *cut off*—'better to live under a sense of partial mutilation and incompleteness than to perish in the enjoyment of all one's powers' (Swete). On the supreme emphasis here upon the all-importance of 'entering into life' (in the sense of the 'life of the world to come'), B. W. Bacon well remarks that 'this portion of the Gospel is full of the echoes of martyrdom'. *Hell* here = 'Gehenna' (R.V. mg.), a metaphorical expression for the fate of the lost at the Judgement, to be carefully distinguished from 'Hell' in the sense of 'Hades' (i. e. the place, state, or condition of departed souls—cf. the words of the Apostles' Creed, 'He descended into hell', i. e. 'He entered into the condition of the departed'). The imagery underlying the use of the term 'Gehenna' is taken from the Valley of the Son of Hinnom, a ravine outside Jerusalem, which in pre-exilic times had been the scene of human sacrifices to Moloch or Melek (Jer vii 31 sqq., xix 5 sqq.); the place was therefore of evil omen, and the Hebrew imagination fixed upon it as the destined locality of the punishment of the wicked (cf. 2 Esdras vii 36). The imagery of worm and fire is borrowed from Is lxvi 24; it suggests maggots preying upon offal, and fires perpetually burning for the destruction of refuse, and perhaps may imply rather the destruction of waste products in God's Creation than the prolonged torture of living beings, and is meant simply to call up an image of extreme horror, rather than to give detailed information as to the fate of the 'lost'.

---

[1] Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, p. 122.

[2] Schürer II i 52.

49. The meaning of this difficult verse is probably that every Christian disciple must be purified by the fire of suffering and persecution: the words *and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.* suggested by Lev ii 13, are probably an early gloss intended to make the thought clearer, viz. suffering purifies the Christian and makes him an acceptable sacrifice to God, just as salt purified the sacrifices offered under the old Law of Judaism.

50 a. A disconnected saying, linked on only by the fact that it contained the key-word 'salt'. The popular opinion of our Lord's time supposed that salt could cease to possess the properties of salt, because in the saline deposits of the Dead Sea, owing to the presence of other chemical substances besides common salt, the appearance of 'salt' might persist after all the 'salt' had actually been dissolved away by rain. The Lord appears to have made use of the metaphor of 'savourless salt' to express the uselessness of a disciple who has lost the true spirit of devotion.

50 b. A further saying about 'salt': Mk by adapting it here brings the conversation of our Lord and His disciples, which (as he arranges the material) had begun by a reference to their dispute by the way as to who should be the greatest, to an appropriate end in an injunction to keep the peace: to which end they must have in themselves the purifying 'salt' of true Christian charity and readiness for sacrifice. The verb translated *be at peace* is used elsewhere in the N.T. only by S. Paul (Rom xii 18, 2 Cor xiii 11, 1 Thess v 13).

CHAPTER X

1. *The journey to Judaea*

(Cf. Mt xix 1–2)

1 And he arose from thence, and cometh into the borders of Judaea and beyond Jordan: and multitudes come together unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again.

The *incognito* which Jesus had maintained while passing through Galilee (ix 30) is now thrown off: the Lord teaches once more in public, and is besieged by the usual crowds. The phrase *beyond Jordan* properly denotes Peraea (lit. 'the country beyond'), a territory on the opposite side of the Jordan from Judaea, which, like Galilee, formed part of the dominions of Herod Antipas, whereas Judaea itself was administered by the Roman procurator Pontius Pilate. If Mk here means to describe a general period of teaching activity, partly in Judaea and partly also in Peraea, the public teaching in the latter district tells against the theory that Jesus avoided the dominions of Herod Antipas for reasons of prudence. If the Lord is to be understood as being *en route* for Jerusalem from Caesarea Philippi onwards, as many scholars suppose, it would be tempting to assume that He travelled south along the eastern bank of the Jordan, instead of going by Samaria, and approached Judaea *via* Peraea, throwing off His *incognito* by the resumption of public teaching as soon as He reached the boundary: but it is doubtful whether the phrase *the borders of Judaea and beyond Jordan* can mean thus strictly the political boundary between Judaea and Peraea: it more probably means 'the territories' of Judaea and Peraea in general. The Western text, accepted here by Wellhausen and others, omits the word *and* after *Judaea*: which most naturally means simply that the Lord visited Peraea, here described as 'the Judaean land beyond the Jordan'. Burkitt, however, who accepts the reading of the Western text, and who also thinks that this portion of Mk is based very literally indeed upon S. Peter's recollections, suggests that our Lord, with James and John (cf. Lk ix 51–56), travelled south by the Samaritan route, while S. Peter and most of the other disciples went round by Peraea and rejoined their Master at the point where the pilgrim-route from Peraea crossed the Jordan to enter Judaea; and that Mk's narrative recounts the story from the point of view of S. Peter and his companions, who, as they reach the rendezvous, catch sight of the Lord arriving in Judaean territory, but 'on the other side of the Jordan' from themselves.[1] Surely a somewhat fanciful theory.

Our Lord arrives on Judaean soil as the famous Galilaean Prophet, thronged by *the multitudes*: it has been remarked by critics that a 'multitude' is always at hand in Mk wherever the narrative requires it, and it would be natural enough to think of a nucleus of Galilaean pilgrims going up to Jerusalem for the Passover, to whom our Lord was well known, and around whom strangers would collect. But the Marcan narrative really presupposes that our Lord was quite as well known in Judaean territory as in Galilee, and this cannot have been His first visit to Jerusalem, nor is it reasonable to doubt that He was accustomed, like other Palestinian Jews who practised their religion, throughout His life to make the three annual pilgrimages to Jerusalem for the feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles.[1]

---

[1] Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 96–97.

2–12. *The question about divorce*

(Cf. Mt xix 3–12, v 31, 32; Lk xvi 18)

2 And there came unto him Pharisees, and asked him, Is it
lawful for a man to put away *his* wife? tempting him.
3 And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses
4 command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write
5 a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. But Jesus said
unto them, For your hardness of heart he wrote you this
6 commandment. But from the beginning of the creation,
7 Male and female made he them. For this cause shall
a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his
8 wife;[1] and the twain shall become one flesh: so that they
9 are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath
10 joined together, let not man put asunder. And in the
11 house the disciples asked him again of this matter. And
he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and
12 marry another, committeth adultery against her: and if she
herself shall put away her husband, and marry another, she
committeth adultery.

Verse 4: cf. Dt xxiv 1, 3. Verse 6: cf. Gen i 27. Verses 7–8: cf. Gen ii 24.

[1] Some ancient authorities omit *and shall cleave to his wife.*

There was no point at which Christian morality contrasted more sharply with the standards tolerated in the Graeco-Roman world than with respect to the ideal of permanent monogamic marriage. Christian converts at Rome were the more in need of instruction with regard to this matter, inasmuch as the subject was one in which the teaching of Jesus transcended the moral standards even of the Old Testament, which (in the LXX version) formed as yet the only sacred Scriptures of the Church, and the question whether it was in any circumstances legitimate for a Christian to take advantage of the Mosaic toleration of divorce must have been at the time when this

---

[1] See further, Introd., pp. xx sq.

Gospel was written a living issue—as indeed, by reason of the 'hardness of men's hearts', it still appears, in a certain sense, to be.

The teaching of our Lord with regard to divorce appears to have stood in 'Q' as well as in Mk (cf. Mt v 31–32, Lk xvi 18). In this Marcan anecdote the Lord is asked His view as to the legitimacy of divorce by questioners who in most MSS. are described as *Pharisees* (the Western text, however, omits the word),[1] and who are said to have been *tempting him*, which probably means that they were trying to entrap Him in some way—perhaps to involve Him in an apparent conflict with the Law: it may be presumed that the views of Jesus about divorce, which coincided with those of the Book of Malachi (Mal ii 14–16), were already notorious. The Lord asks what did Moses *command*, to which His questioners, with an implicit reference to Dt xxiv 1–3, reply that Moses *permitted* divorce, provided only that there was compliance with certain legal formalities (intended to safeguard the position of the repudiated wife). The Lord, pointing out that this was merely a concession to the hardness of human hearts, appeals behind the Mosaic toleration and regulation of divorce to the primary institution of marriage as such, and deduces from Genesis the ideal of permanent and indissoluble marriage.

That this was really the ideal of Jesus appears unquestionable, and the Marcan version appears primary, as against the Matthaean, which is secondary, and which by means of interpolated glosses[2] so modifies the sense of our Lord's words as to represent Him as having merely taken sides in a current rabbinical dispute.

---

[1] The textual evidence for the omission of *Pharisees* here is strong. If the word is omitted the main verb should be construed impersonally—so frequently in Mk—and the meaning will be 'And people came unto him, and asked', &c.

[2] *For every cause* (Mt xix 3) and *except for fornication* (Mt xix 9): cf. also *saving for the cause of fornication* in Mt v 32—the Matthaean version of a saying from 'Q', more accurately reproduced in Lk xvi 8. The interpretation of Dt xxiv 1–3 was a matter of dispute between the rival Pharisaic schools of Hillel and Shammai, the former of which held that the Law allowed a man to divorce his wife practically *for every cause* (R. 'Aqiba eventually said 'if he find another woman more beautiful'), while the latter maintained that the sole legitimate cause was the wife's infidelity. The added clauses in Mt have the effect of making our Lord agree with Shammai against Hillel, thereby (1) converting what is really a statement in absolute terms of the true and positive ideal of marriage into a piece of casuistical legislation, and (2) destroying the sequence of our Lord's argument by making Him acknowledge the permanent validity (provided that Shammai's interpretation be accepted) of the very law (Dt xxiv 1–3) which He has just criticized as a Mosaic accommodation to the hardness of men's hearts. The Lord is not, of course, criticizing 'Moses', since the Law is for Him, here as elsewhere, the 'commandment of God': but He is explaining the Law of Divorce in the Pentateuch as being a concession which, however necessary in view of the hardness of men's hearts at the time, is nevertheless a departure from the true and original ideal of marriage, and an accommodation to human weakness such as is wholly out of keeping with the new and higher righteousness of the Kingdom of God. The Matthaean modifications reflect the standpoint of a Jewish Christianity which could not bring itself to believe that Jesus had really been stricter than even the strictest school of rabbinical exegetes, or had taken up a position which virtually abrogated a Pentateuchal law. It is contended by some scholars (e.g. Wellhausen, Klostermann, R. H. Charles, and H. G. Wood) that the exceptive clauses in Mt, though admittedly

Inasmuch as the Roman, though not the Jewish, law allowed not only a husband to divorce his wife, but also a wife to divorce her husband, Mk adds for the benefit of his Roman readers an explanation (represented as having been given by Jesus to the disciples privately—cf. vii 17 sqq. and notes *ad loc.*) to the effect that the Lord's teaching forbade either party to a marriage to divorce the other (verses 10–12).

6–8. Wellhausen and Klostermann translate 'But in the beginning of the Creation story' (i. e. in the beginning of Genesis), and supply 'he' (i. e. Moses) 'wrote': perhaps rightly. In any case *Male and female made he them* is a citation from Gen i 27, and *For this cause . . . become one flesh* a citation, slightly modified by the insertion of the words *the twain* (which occur in the LXX, though not in the Hebrew) from Gen ii 24, and the point of the argument is not to confute 'Moses' by an appeal to the higher authority of God, but to appeal from the concession made by 'Moses' to the hardness of human hearts in Deuteronomy to what 'Moses' himself had previously written in Genesis. The term *flesh* in the passage quoted from Genesis means virtually a blood relationship (cf. Gen xxix 14): the sense of the passage is that marriage constitutes a relationship as real and as indissoluble as that which binds a man to his relations by blood, while the obligations of a man towards his wife take precedence even over his obligations towards his parents, because of the new unit of family life which marriage potentially establishes.

9. So far as the Greek goes, the word *man* in antithesis to *God* could be taken to mean 'any human authority'. But it is probable that the *man* who is contemplated as seeking to *put asunder* what *God hath joined* is the husband: in Jewish law the husband divorced the wife, in Roman law either party could divorce the other: under neither system were the parties 'divorced' by extraneous authority.

10–12. The probable explanation of these verses is as above. Burkitt, however, thinks that verse 12 is a genuine saying of our Lord, and that there is an historical allusion to the case of Herodias,

---

interpolations, nevertheless correctly interpret our Lord's meaning, it being supposed that the case of adultery was excluded from consideration on the ground that it was already dealt with in Dt xxii 22, and that the penalty against a proved adulteress was death. This ill accords, however, with the known fact that the Shammaite school recognized adultery as the sole legitimate ground for *divorce*; and the best rabbinical authorities are of opinion that the regulation of Dt xxii 22 had become virtually obsolete by the time of our Lord (cf. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* i, pp. 73–74). The contentions of R. H. Charles's extremely perverse little book *The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce* are well answered by G. H. Box and C. Gore, *Divorce in the New Testament* (S.P.C.K.). The Eastern Church follows S. Matthew's Gospel in recognizing divorce on the ground of adultery: the Canon Law of the Western Church recognizes in certain circumstances divorce *a mensa et toro*, but never divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* with liberty of remarriage.

who had left her husband (possibly availing herself of the procedure of Roman law to divorce him) in order to live with Antipas, who in turn was a *divorcé* like herself.[1] The Western text in Codex Bezae reads 'and if a woman depart from her husband and marry another', which might be both an allusion to Herodias and also a legally accurate description of her conduct. The Old Syriac version inverts the order of verses 11, 12—the offending woman being thus blamed first—and Burkitt thinks that this is the true order, the saying as a whole being primarily an utterance *à propos* of the case of Herodias.

13–16. *The blessing of the children*

(Cf. Mt xix 13–15; Lk. xviii 15–17)

13 And they brought unto him little children, that he should
14 touch them: and the disciples rebuked them. But when
Jesus saw it, he was moved with indignation, and said unto
them, Suffer the little children to come unto me; forbid them
15 not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto
you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as
16 a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein. And he
took them in his arms, and blessed them, laying his hands
upon them.

For the Lord's love of children cf. ix 36, 37. It is not necessary to suppose that the two episodes are 'doublets' of one another. Some commentators refer to an alleged Jewish custom of bringing children to be blessed by synagogue-rulers, but the motive of those who brought the children to Jesus is more probably the simply instinctive impulse to secure for them the 'touch' of the great wonder-working Prophet, which would be regarded as carrying with it a blessing, exactly as Italian peasants to-day bring their little ones to receive the blessing of a Cardinal, or the sanctifying touch of a holy relic of some saint. The disciples wish to spare the Master from being troubled, as one might wish to safeguard a famous man from the embarrassing solicitations of autograph-hunters to-day. But Jesus is *moved with indignation* at their heartlessness—the only passage in the Gospels in which this particular emotion is ascribed to Him.

Of such is the kingdom of God probably means not 'the Kingdom of God consists of such' but 'the Kingdom of God *belongs to* such', i. e. they are its destined inheritors. The point of the comparison is not so much the innocence and humility of children (for children are not invariably either innocent or humble): it is rather the fact that children are unselfconscious, receptive, and content to be dependent upon others' care and bounty; it is in such a spirit that the Kingdom must be 'received'—it is a gift of God, and not an achievement on the part of man; it must be simply accepted, inasmuch as it can never be deserved. Note that the 'Kingdom' is here described both as a gift which men 'receive' and as a sphere into which they 'enter'. Loisy and J. Weiss, however, think that the phrase 'Kingdom of God' has here become simply a synonym for Christian salvation in a quite general sense.

---

[1] Burkitt, *op. cit.*, pp. 100, 101.

The Lord, by taking the children *in his arms* (peculiar to Mk, cf. ix 36) and blessing them, *laying his hands upon them*, does more than He had been asked to do. The word translated *blessed them* means 'He blessed them fervently'. The Church has from early times interpreted this episode as a justification of Infant Baptism—an application of it which in principle is sound enough, however remote from the literal meaning of the story.

17–22. *The great refusal*

(Cf. Mt xix 16–22; Lk xviii 18–23)

17 And as he was going forth into the way,[1] there ran one to
him, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master,[2]
18 what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? And Jesus
said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good
19 save one, *even* God. Thou knowest the commandments, Do
not kill, Do not commit adultery, Do not steal, Do not bear
false witness, Do not defraud, Honour thy father and
20 mother. And he said unto him, Master,[2] all these things
21 have I observed from my youth. And Jesus looking upon
him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest:
go, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and
thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me.
22 But his countenance fell at the saying, and he went away
sorrowful: for he was one that had great possessions.

Verse 19: cf. Ex xx 12–16; Dt v 16–20.

[1] Or, *on his way.*

[2] Or, *Teacher.*

Mt describes the rich man of this story as a 'youth', Lk as a 'ruler'. Mk links the story on to what precedes by saying that he came to Jesus *as he was going forth into the way*, i. e. as He was leaving the *house* in which He is supposed to have been since verse 10.

With Oriental effusiveness the rich man comes running to Jesus, kneels as a suppliant before Him, and, addressing Him by the flattering title of 'Good Rabbi', demands to know what he must do to enter into *eternal life* (here virtually the equivalent, like *life* in ix 43, 45, of the Kingdom of God: cf. Dan xii 2; Secrets of Enoch, lxv 8). The Lord somewhat damps his enthusiasm, declares that God only is *good*, and refusing to give any cut-and-dried recipe for entrance into 'life', refers him in the first instance to the ancient commandments of God. The man's reply need not be interpreted as an expression of self-righteousness: he means simply that he has from his youth been accustomed to observe the Law, but that he is inwardly dissatisfied and feels that there is some higher demand which he is ready to fulfil. We are told that Jesus liked the man,[1] and offered to accept him as one of His immediate circle of disciples, but with the warning that this would mean homelessness and poverty. No doubt with insight into the man's peculiar character and temptations, He bids him sell and distribute all that he has in exchange for *treasure in heaven*: but the sacrifice demanded proves to be too great, and the man goes sorrowfully away.

It is not necessary to infer from this story that Jesus regarded earthly riches as being intrinsically evil, or taught literal poverty as the ideal for *every* disciple of the Way. The point of the story as it stands in the Gospel is to teach that truly to 'follow' Jesus (i. e. to be a spiritual disciple of the Master who trod the path of uttermost sacrifice, and who had not where to lay His head) involves the renunciation, literal or spiritual, of all things earthly for His sake. The call is for heroic sacrifice; a merely negative blamelessness in respect of the Ten Commandments is not enough; and the possession of wealth, which ensnares men's hearts and makes them shrink from entire self-giving, *may* prove a spiritual stumbling-block to be abandoned. The call to a life of literal poverty which came to a S. Antony or to a S. Francis of Assisi has come also to countless others, and is involved in every vocation to the 'religious' life in the technical sense of the word. But it is not a universal call. What the Gospel demands of all men universally is inward detachment from the world: from this point of view the Lord taught certainly that riches are a peril: and if freedom from ensnaring entanglements cannot be secured except by cutting the knot, the knot must be cut.

17. *Good Master*: the word rendered 'Master' means 'Teacher' (R.V. mg.) or 'Rabbi'. The epithet appears to have been a somewhat obsequious piece of conventional flattery, a *captatio benevolentiae*, from the unreality of which our Lord recoiled. 'He desired no flattery, still less would he tolerate irony' (Abrahams).

18. It has been proposed to argue, in the interest of orthodoxy,

---

[1] On the Oriental use of the word 'love' to express 'any cordial inclination of approval' see A. M. Rihbany, *The Syrian Christ*, pp. 71 sqq.

that our Lord by His reply meant not to deny that He was good, but to lead the inquirer to draw the conclusion that He was God. This does not appear to be a possible view of the passage: on the other hand, it is not necessary, with Montefiore, to infer that 'of Jesus, both in fact and in his own estimate of himself, the adage was true: "there is no man that sinneth not"'. The words of Jesus here are rather 'the expression of that humility which was part of the moral perfection' of His character (H. G. Wood). He shrinks from the touch of a flattery which shocks His religious sense. All human goodness derives from God, and this was no less true in the case of the ideally perfect human character of the Man Christ Jesus than in that of others. The Lord therefore refuses the ascription to Himself personally of merit, as it were, in independence of God: as a Christian saint in the like case might say 'Not I, but Christ', so the Lord says virtually 'Not I, but My Father' (cf. Jn v 19 sqq.). Mt already found the verse difficult, and modified it (Mt xix 17).

19. The commandments which Jesus here rapidly rehearses are a rough summary of the so-called 'second Table' of the Decalogue, the fifth commandment being for some reason placed last, and the tenth being replaced by *Do not defraud* (cf. Dt xxiv 14, Ecclus iv 1), perhaps because to defraud the poor might be regarded as the special temptation of the rich.

22. The apocryphal *Gospel according to the Hebrews* represents the inquirer as 'scratching his head' at this point, whereupon 'the Lord said to him, How canst thou say, I have fulfilled the Law and the Prophets? For it is written in the Law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; and behold, many of thy brethren the sons of Abraham are covered with filth and dying of hunger, and thy house is full of good things, and nothing goes from it to them.'

23–31. *Wealth in relation to the Kingdom*

(Cf. Mt xix 23–30; Lk xviii 24–30, xiii 30)

23 And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples,
How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the
24 kingdom of God! And the disciples were amazed at his
words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them,
Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches[1] to
25 enter into the kingdom of God! It is easier for a camel to
go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter
26 into the kingdom of God. And they were astonished

---

[1] Some ancient authorities omit *for them that trust in riches.*

exceedingly, saying unto him,[1] Then who can be saved?
27 Jesus looking upon them saith, With men it is impossible,
but not with God: for all things are possible with God.
28 Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have
29 followed thee. Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, There is
no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or
mother, or father, or children, or lands, for my sake, and
30 for the gospel's sake, but he shall receive a hundredfold now
in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers,
and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the
31 world [2] to come eternal life. But many *that are* first shall
be last; and the last first.

[1] Many ancient authorities read *among themselves.* [2] Or, *age.*

R.V. follows the 'Western' text in verse 24, with the result that the whole of verses 23–26 refer to the difficulty of salvation for the rich. The words *for them that trust in riches* are omitted, however, by B &c. (cf. R.V. mg.), and appear to be a gloss attenuating the absoluteness of a 'hard saying', in which the Lord, after commenting on the special difficulty inherent in the possession of wealth (verse 23), goes on to speak in general terms of the difficulty of salvation for any man—*Children, how hard a thing it is to enter the kingdom of God* (verse 24). But as the text now stands the following verse recurs again to the special case of the rich, and the intensified astonishment of the disciples (verse 26) is then somewhat difficult to interpret. Wellhausen, who points out that what we need is a progressive intensification of our Lord's paradox, corresponding to the progressive astonishment of the disciples, proposes either to follow D and certain other authorities in transposing the order of verses 24, 25, or to cut out from the text of verse 25 the words *than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.* This latter proposal would give an excellent sense, but since there is no MS. authority for the suggested omission in verse 25, it is better to adopt the alternative solution, i. e. to follow D in transposing verses 24, 25, but to omit from verse 24 the words *for them that trust in riches* as a gloss.

In verse 27 D and some Old Latin authorities read, 'With men it is impossible but with God it is possible', and omit altogether the words *For all things are possible with God.*[1] So, too, in verse 30 there are variant readings in D and in the text implied by a quotation in Clement of Alexandria, but it is probable that the R.V. text is right.

---

[1] It would be tempting to regard these words as an added gloss; but they appear to have influenced the wording, though not the sense, of the Gk. text of Mt xix 26, Lk xviii 27, and are therefore probably original in Mk.

Wellhausen, however, would punctuate *shall receive a hundredfold—now in this time houses . . . with persecutions, and in the world to come eternal life.* It seems in any case probable that the words which follow *a hundredfold* are an interpretative addition to the original saying of our Lord, based on the experience of the earliest Christians that—despite the persecutions which befell them—they found even now abundant compensation for the sacrifice of home ties and possessions in the spiritual kinship and communal life of the Christian Society (cf. Rom xvi 13, Acts ii 44, iv 34). If the whole saying were authentic it would be tempting to think of our Lord's own experience also (cf. iii 31–35, and notes *ad loc.*). But it seems likely that the original 'Q' form of the saying is given in Mt xix 29.

23. For Jesus 'looking round about', cf. iii 5, 34, v 32, xi 11. Rabbinical teaching, while recognizing that wealth may be a source of temptation, that it involves the duty of generous almsgiving, that it is in any case a relative term, and that the true riches is contentment, nevertheless, on the whole, looked upon the possession of wealth as a blessing appropriately bestowed upon the righteous, and in no sense as an evil.[1] Our Lord emphasizes far more strongly the spiritual danger of riches.

24. If verses 24 and 25 are transposed (see above) there is no need to suppose with Swete and Menzies that the disciples naïvely imagined that entry into the Kingdom would be specially easy for the rich. Their astonishment and dismay here and in verse 26 is due to our Lord's general emphasis on the extreme difficulty of salvation.

25. The theory that the *needle's eye* is really a postern gate which a camel could squeeze through only with difficulty has no authority more trustworthy than the imaginative conjectures of modern guides to Jerusalem. The explanation that the word translated *camel* has been confused with a similar word meaning *rope* goes back to Cyril of Alexandria, but is certainly to be rejected. Our Lord makes use of a current proverbial phrase to express that which is so difficult as to amount to an impossibility. The words should be taken literally. With the substitution of 'elephant' for *camel* the proverb occurs in the Babylonian Talmud.

27. Salvation is an impossibility only in the sense that it is impossible on the basis of merely human effort. It is a supernatural work of divine grace.

28. The disciples have done what the rich man refused to do. Mt adds quite naïvely *What then shall we have?* The saying preserved in Mt xix 28, Lk xxii 29–30, appears to have stood at this point in 'Q'. Mk, if it was known to him, may have omitted it as unlikely to interest Gentiles.

29. *And for the gospel's sake*: cf. viii 35. The words are probably

---

[1] Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T.* i, pp. 826 sqq.; Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* i, pp. 113 sqq.

in both passages an editorial addition to the original saying of our Lord.

30. On the criticism of this verse see above. The saying as it stands gave rise in early times to the millenarian interpretation attacked by S. Jerome,[1] and to the sneer of Julian the Apostate, who asked whether the faithful were to have a hundred wives (cf. Lk xviii 29). The words *with persecutions* may possibly be an insertion in the text, since they are missing from Lk xviii 30.

31. Cf. Mt xx 16, Lk xiii 30. In its present context the saying probably means either (1) that those who are *first* in this world (i. e. the rich and prosperous) shall in many cases be *last* in the world to come, and *vice versa*, or (2) that those who have been called *first* (i. e. the existing disciples of Jesus) have no guarantee that they will eventually stand first; they must persevere, or others who come later to the Gospel will outstrip them spiritually. The view of Loisy that the saying represents Mk's championship of the claims of S. Paul and other later evangelists as against the position of the Twelve has no plausibility.

32–34. *A third prediction of the Passion*

(Cf. Mt xx 17–19; Lk xviii 31–34)

32 And they were in the way, going up to Jerusalem; and
Jesus was going before them: and they were amazed; and
they that followed[1] were afraid. And he took again the
twelve, and began to tell them the things that were to happen
33 unto him, *saying*, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the
Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and
the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall
34 deliver him unto the Gentiles: and they shall mock him,
and shall spit upon him, and shall scourge him, and shall
kill him; and after three days he shall rise again.

[1] Or, *but some as they followed were afraid.*

Jerusalem as the goal of our Lord's journey is here for the first time mentioned in Mk. 'The striking picture of the Master walking alone in front, the wonder-stricken disciples behind, and, still farther in the rear, a group of terrified adherents, is peculiar to this Gospel' (W. C. Allen). C. H. Turner, on the other hand, argues strongly in favour of the translation 'and they (i. e. the disciples), as they followed, were afraid'; the two verbs rendered 'go before' and 'follow' are, he thinks, strictly correlative in Mk (cf. xi 9; also xiv 28, xvi 7, and Additional Notes, p. 270). He further proposes to substitute the singular for the plural form of the verb translated *were amazed*, and to regard our Lord as the subject of it, remarking that 'if it was the Master on whom, in anticipation of Gethsemane (xiv 33), this shuddering awe fell, we can understand how He wished to be alone, and how the disciples, as they followed at a little distance, "were afraid"'.[1] The suggestion remains, of course, a purely conjectural emendation of the text.

---

[1] *Ex occasione huius sententiae, quidam introducunt mille annos post resurrectionem* (Hieron. *apud* Migne, P. L. xxvi 139).

It has been often remarked that each of the three predictions of the Passion in this Gospel, taken by itself, would give the impression that the subject had not been mentioned before: and the disciples are represented as showing the same lack of understanding on each occasion. The prediction here is decidedly the most specific and detailed of the three (cf. viii 31, ix 30–32), and the specific details are probably *ex eventu.* Nevertheless, Mk's 'view that Jesus more than once foretold the Passion, and that the disciples could not believe it, may still correspond with facts.' (H. G. Wood.)

35–40. *The request of the sons of Zebedee*

(Cf. Mt xx 20–23)

35 And there come near unto him James and John, the sons
of Zebedee, saying unto him, Master,[1] we would that thou
36 shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall ask of thee. And
he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for
37 you? And they said unto him, Grant unto us that we may
sit, one on thy right hand, and one on *thy* left hand, in thy
38 glory. But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye
ask. Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink? or to be
39 baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? And
they said unto him, We are able. And Jesus said unto them,
The cup that I drink ye shall drink; and with the baptism
40 that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized: but to sit
on my right hand or on *my* left hand is not mine to give:
but *it is for them* for whom it hath been prepared.

[1] Or, *Teacher.*

In Mt this story is softened, so far as the credit of the disciples is concerned, by the ascription of the initiative not to the sons of

---

[1] C. H. Turner, *The Study of the N.T.: an Inaugural Lecture*, p. 62.

Zebedee themselves, but to their mother; Lk omits the story altogether. It rests no doubt upon authentic reminiscence, but appears quite disconnected with the immediate context here, and may originally have formed the sequel to the saying in 'Q' about thrones of judgement (Mt xix 28, Lk xxii 30). Lk places the latter saying, together with the dispute about precedence and our Lord's teaching about true greatness which in Mk follows the present episode, in the context of the Last Supper (Lk xxii 24–30). It has often been remarked that Mk x 32–45, and ix 30–37 are curiously parallel, since in each case a dispute about precedence, followed by teaching on the part of our Lord about true greatness, is appended to a prediction of the Passion. B. W. Bacon regards in any case verses 41–45 as a 'manifest doublet of ix 33–35'; for other possible 'doublets' in the Gospel see note on viii 1–9 *supra*.

Klostermann notes that the request of the sons of Zebedee, despite the fact that they still address our Lord simply as *Master* (i. e. Rabbi), implies clearly that the disciples were convinced, before our Lord's death, of His future messianic *glory*. The Marcan phrase is compatible with the thought either of thrones of judgement (Mt xix 28, Lk xxii 30) or of the future glories of the messianic Feast (Mk xiv 25); Mt glosses the saying so as to make it refer explicitly to the messianic *Kingdom* (Mt xx 21). The Lord meets the request of the two disciples by asking whether they are able to share His Cup and His Baptism. The allusion appears to be to the cup of suffering (Mk xiv 36) and the baptism of death (Lk xii 50). The two disciples, perhaps hardly understanding what was meant, reply naïvely *We are able*. The Lord accepts their goodwill, and asserts that they shall indeed do so, but that nevertheless the disposal of places of honour in the Kingdom rests not with the Messiah during His life on earth (cf. xiii 32), but with the Father (so rightly Mt xx 23), by whose predestinating counsel they are indeed already determined.

Of the two brothers, S. James was eventually martyred (Acts xii 2), and S. John also, according to a tradition ascribed to Papias,[1] though the more generally accepted Church tradition identifies him with the author of the Fourth Gospel, and makes him die peacefully in old age at Ephesus.[2] Later legends attempted to combine this latter tradition with a quasi-fulfilment of our Lord's prediction by speaking of a 'baptism' in boiling oil[3] and of a 'cup' of poison,[4] from the effects of both of which S. John was alleged to have been miraculously preserved. It is argued by Harnack that the reason why Lk omitted the Marcan story of the request of Zebedee's sons and our Lord's reply was the fact that he knew that the prophecy had not been fulfilled in the case of S. John.[1] J. Weiss, on the other hand, maintains that the Marcan story presupposes the martyrdom of both the brothers as an already accomplished fact at the time of writing, and remarks that 'the tradition here followed represents an account coloured by the results of reflection upon the strange destiny of the two apostles. They were known to have been ambitious of high honour. Their wish is now fulfilled, but in a quite other fashion than they intended. They have been exalted [*sc.* by martyrdom] to their Master's heavenly throne; and the actual terms of their request have been recast so as to correspond with this fulfilment. The narrator, by making Jesus say *Ye know not what ye ask*, means us to understand the apostles' request as an unconscious prophecy of their own death. They did not know what they were asking, but Jesus interpreted to them how it would be fulfilled.'

---

[1] The authorities for this are a MS. of the ninth-century Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolus, and a seventh- or eighth-century MS. at Oxford of an epitome of a fifth-century work by Philip of Sidé.

[2] On the question of S. John's martyrdom see R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of S. John* i, Introd., pp. xlv sqq.; and for a defence of the more usual tradition J. H. Bernard, *Studia Sacra*, pp. 260 sqq.

[3] Tertullian, *De praescriptione*, 36; Jerome, *c. Jovin.* i 26.

[4] *Acta Joannis*, 9 (in Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* II i 156); cf. M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 228.

36. Wellhausen accepts the reading of D, which makes our Lord simply promise to grant the disciples' request (i. e. 'I will do it for you' instead of *What would ye that I should do for you?*). It is probable that the more usual text is right, and that the omission in D is accidental.

38. 'As the baptism of water was the initiation of the Messiah *incognito*, so the baptism of death is the initiation of the Messiah of glory' (Wellhausen). For the metaphor of the *cup* cf. Is li 17, Jer xlix 12, Mk xiv 36; and for the general idea underlying the metaphor of *baptism* cf. Pss xlii 7, lxix 2, 15, cxxiv 4–5, Lk xii 50; also a papyrus of the second century B. C., now at Paris, in which the corresponding Gk. verb is used vulgarly to mean 'flooded', in the sense of 'overwhelmed with calamities'.[2] For 'the cup of Christ' in the sense of 'martyrdom' cf. *Mart. Polycarpi* XIV. The reference to *baptism* is wanting in Mt xx 23. B. W. Bacon thinks it an editorial addition in Mk, the original saying being expanded so as to correspond more completely with the sacramental practice of the Church. If there is thus an intentional allusion on the part of Mk to the sacraments of Baptism and of the Eucharist, the point of it will be to drive home the lesson that to receive Christian Baptism and to become a partaker in the Eucharist, in the circumstances of the Christian Church at Rome in the days of Nero, is to take a step which is likely to lead to the suffering of death by martyrdom, and it behoves catechumens to count the cost. The verse as it stands provided the Scriptural basis of the later ecclesiastical view that martyrdom on the part of a catechumen was to be reckoned as equivalent to baptism (the so-called 'baptism of blood').

---

[1] Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, E.T., p. 134.

[2] Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Gk. Testament* ii, p. 102.

41–45. *Rank and precedence among Christians*

(Cf. Mt xx 24–28; Lk xxii 24–27)

41 And when the ten heard it, they began to be moved with
42 indignation concerning James and John. And Jesus called
them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they
which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over
them; and their great ones exercise authority over them.
43 But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become
44 great among you, shall be your minister:[1] and whosoever
45 would be first among you, shall be servant[2] of all. For
verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to
minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

[1] Or, *servant.* [2] Gk. *bondservant.*

'Here we are no longer concerned with the future Kingdom of God, but with the Christian community. There must be no quarrelling about rank and precedence therein' (Wellhausen). In the Christian community, he who would be greatest among the guests at table must act not as a guest on whom others are to wait, but as an attendant waiting upon the guests (cf. Lk xxii 27): he who would be first in the household must assume the position not of the master but of the slave: cf. the Papal title *servus servorum Dei.* Even the mission of the Son of Man is the mission of the Lord's ideal Servant, and the death which He anticipates as the culmination of His service is a free redemptive act on behalf of *many.*

42. The foreign world-rulers are regarded from the point of view of a more or less oppressed and subject race. Lk xxii 25 introduces an ironical reference to the title 'Benefactor', historically borne by certain members of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid dynasties in Egypt and in Syria respectively. *They which are accounted to rule* may mean simply those who are in the position of rulers (cf. Gal ii 2, 6, 9); or it may convey the suggestion that the Roman Caesars are only in appearance the rulers of the world; the true rule is that of God.

43. The positive *great* stands here, in accordance with Semitic usage, for the superlative 'greatest' or 'chief', as is clear from the parallelism in verse 44.

45. This verse has no parallel in Lk, and has been endlessly discussed—so most elaborately, in a sense unfavourable to its genuineness as an original saying of our Lord, by Rashdall in a note appended to the first of his *Bampton Lectures.*[1] Bousset believes

---

[1] Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, pp. 49 sqq.

Lk xxii 27 to be the original utterance out of which Mk x 45 has arisen by way of dogmatic development.[1] Wellhausen and Loisy consider that the thought of the life given as a *ransom for many* (verse 45) belongs to a wholly different sequence of ideas from that of the *servant of all* (verse 44). To say this, however, is to fail to perceive that the two sayings are linked together by the general idea of service, and that it was the thought of the ideal Servant of the Lord in Isaiah liii which in all probability suggested to our Lord's own mind the interpretation of His coming death as a supreme act of service, the giving of His life as a *ransom for many*.[2] The great saying, despite its omission by Lk, is in all probability genuine, and the reference to *many* (interpreted wrongly by Schweitzer as limiting the scope of our Lord's self-sacrifice, as though He died only for those who were 'elect' or predestined to the Kingdom, and not for all)[3] is to be explained as an echo of the repeated *many* of Is liii 11, 12. 1 Tim ii 6 has *all*. For the 'ransom' metaphor elsewhere in the N.T. cf. 1 Pet i 18, Heb ix 12. As used in the LXX the word here translated *ransom* means usually a monetary compensation paid for a crime (Num xxxv 31, 32, Prov vi 35, xiii 8), or for a life which would otherwise be forfeit (Ex xxi 30): it is also used of the ransom of a slave or captive (Lev xxv 51, 52, Is xlv 13), for the right to buy back land that has been sold (Lev xxv 24) and for the price paid for it (Lev xxv 26); of an equivalent accepted instead of the sacrifice of the first-born (Num xviii 15), and of the Levites, accepted as an equivalent for the tribes of Israel as a whole (Num iii 12); further, the half-shekel poll-tax of Ex xxx 12 to be paid by every Israelite is described as 'a ransom for his life unto the Lord'. For the idea of the deaths of righteous martyrs being accepted as an equivalent or compensation for the sins of the people, cf. 4 Macc vi 29, xvii 22, 2 Macc vii 37, sqq.[4] The kindred Gk. words rendered 'redeem' and 'redemption' are used in the N.T. and in the LXX to express the idea of a 'deliverance' wrought by God on behalf of His people, without any special emphasis on the idea of a *ransom*. It is probable, therefore, that in the case of our Lord's saying here the idea of the 'ransom' metaphor ought not to be rigorously pressed (i.e. that *ransom* = simply 'means of deliverance' or of redemption). The phrase sums up the general thought of Is liii, and expresses the idea of a vicarious and voluntary giving of life, with the thought also implied that the sacrifice was in some way mysteriously necessitated by sin. Jewish Christians would eventually understand it as meaning that the death of the Messiah was the means of redemption for Israel. Gentile readers would understand it as meaning that by the death of Jesus Christ they had been set free from their old sinful life and from the power and dominion of the demons.

---

[1] W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 8.

[2] Cf. E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, p. 221, and see further Additional Notes, pp. 254 sqq.

[3] Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 388; cf. p. 353.

[4] In 4 Macc vi 29 the Maccabaean martyr Eleazar is represented as saying 'Make my blood their purification, and take my life to ransom their lives': in 4 Macc xvii 20–22 it is said of the Maccabaean martyrs that 'through them . . . our country was purified, they having as it were become a ransom for the nation's sin'.

46–52. *Bartimaeus*

(Cf. Mt xx 29–34 ; Lk xviii 35–43)

46 And they come to Jericho: and as he went out from
Jericho, with his disciples and a great multitude, the son of
Timaeus, Bartimaeus, a blind beggar, was sitting by the
47 way side. And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth,
he began to cry out, and say, Jesus, thou son of David, have
48 mercy on me. And many rebuked him, that he should hold
his peace: but he cried out the more a great deal, Thou son
49 of David, have mercy on me. And Jesus stood still, and
said, Call ye him. And they call the blind man, saying
50 unto him, Be of good cheer: rise, he calleth thee. And he,
casting away his garment, sprang up, and came to Jesus.
51 And Jesus answered him, and said, What wilt thou that
I should do unto thee? And the blind man said unto him,
52 Rabboni, that I may receive my sight. And Jesus said
unto him, Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole.[1]
And straightway he received his sight, and followed him in
the way.

---

[1] Or, *saved thee.*

Jericho was about fifteen miles NE. of Jerusalem. The pilgrim route is thronged, and Jesus on His way to Jerusalem is now travelling as the great Prophet, surrounded by an enthusiastic crowd. This episode of Bartimaeus was vividly remembered and precisely located in the tradition, presumably because the blind beggar publicly addressed our Lord by the Messianic title *Son of David*; he is not rebuked by Jesus for so doing, though the title as popularly understood was hardly calculated to suggest the kind of Messiah our Lord conceived Himself to be (cf. xii 35–37). It is evident that the rumour that Jesus was, or claimed to be, in some sense the Messiah had by this time become widespread, and it is in a Messianic capacity that He is about to enter Jerusalem. The blind man's proclamation thus in a sense prepares the way for the

Triumphal Entry (cf. xi 9–10). That the ancient hope of a restored Kingdom of David was still a living issue in our Lord's time is clear from the almost contemporary Psalms of Solomon (cf. Pss Sol xvii 23). On the probability that it may have been known in our Lord's own lifetime that a literal Davidic descent was claimed for the family into which He was born, see Dalman, *Words of Jesus* [E.T.], pp. 319 sqq., and cf. Rom i 3, and the genealogies in Mt and Lk.

46. A position just outside the city gate on the road leading to Jerusalem would be an excellent 'pitch' for begging purposes. *The son of Timaeus* is a translation of *Bartimaeus*, which itself is a patronymic which has apparently become a proper name. *Timaeus* is of course a well-known Greek name, but probably conceals here an Aramaic proper name. Elsewhere in Mk the Gk. translation does not precede but follows the Aramaic which it renders (cf. iii 17, vii 11, 34, xiv 36): we should have expected therefore the order here to be reversed, and it is possible that *the son of Timaeus* is a gloss which has crept into the text. Mt and Lk do not give the name at all. The attempts which have been made to derive the supposed Aramaic original of *Timaeus* from a word meaning 'blind' or 'impure' deserve no serious consideration.

48. It is not to be supposed that the crowd are anxious to prevent the so-called 'Messianic secret' from being divulged, or that they wish to reserve the proclamation for the Triumphal Entry: they merely do not wish the progress of the Master to be interrupted.

50. The Syriac and Ethiopic versions have 'casting his garment about him': but the reading in the text is probably right. The beggar flings aside his cloak in order to run more quickly.

51. The crowd might have supposed him to be merely making his usual beggar's request for alms. Our Lord challenges him to say outright what he really desires. *Rabboni*, a variant of 'Rabbi' which occurs also in Jn xx 16, is probably intended to convey a somewhat higher degree of respect than the shorter and more usual form.

52. On the equivalence of *to save* and *to make whole* see note on iii 1–6, and cf. v 34. The primary meaning here is the one in R.V. text. God has cured the man in response to his faith, whereupon he forsakes his position as a wayside beggar and follows in Jesus' train on the road to Jerusalem. It is possible, however, that there is also a *double entente*. No doubt the man's name was remembered because he became afterwards a Christian. He has been *saved* in a spiritual sense, and 'follows' Jesus *in the way* of discipleship. The Messiah has opened the eyes of the blind: cf. Is lxi 1 (LXX and R.V. mg.).

CHAPTER XI

1–11. *The triumphal entry*

(Cf. Mt xxi 1–9; Lk xix 28–38)

1 And when they draw nigh unto Jerusalem, unto Bethphage
and Bethany, at the mount of Olives, he sendeth two of his
2 disciples, and saith unto them, Go your way into the village
that is over against you: and straightway as ye enter into
it, ye shall find a colt tied, whereon no man ever yet sat;
3 loose him, and bring him. And if any one say unto you,
Why do ye this? say ye, The Lord hath need of him; and
4 straightway he will send[1] him back hither.[2] And they went
away, and found a colt tied at the door without in the open
5 street; and they loose him. And certain of them that
stood there said unto them, What do ye, loosing the colt?
6 And they said unto them even as Jesus had said: and they
7 let them go. And they bring the colt unto Jesus, and cast
8 on him their garments; and he sat upon him. And many
spread their garments upon the way; and others branches,[3]
9 which they had cut from the fields. And they that went
before, and they that followed, cried, Hosanna; Blessed *is*
10 he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Blessed *is* the
kingdom that cometh, *the kingdom* of our father David:
11 Hosanna in the highest.

And he entered into Jerusalem, into the temple; and
when he had looked round about upon all things, it being
now eventide, he went out unto Bethany with the twelve.

Verses 9, 10: cf. Ps cxviii 25, 26.

---

[1] Gr. *sendeth.*

[2] Or, *again.*

[3] Gr. *layers of leaves.*

The purpose of this story, from the point of view of Mk, is clearly to represent Jesus' entry into Jerusalem as (in B. W. Bacon's phrase) 'the Coming of Zion's King'. The Messiah enters the capital city no longer on foot but mounted, and surrounded by rejoicing and expectant multitudes, who do Him royal homage and acclaim the anticipated restoration of David's throne. Nevertheless, it is not as a temporal ruler at the head of an army that He approaches, but in a guise which recalls rather the picture in Zechariah's prophecy of a peaceful monarch, 'just and having salvation' and yet 'lowly and riding upon an ass' (Zech ix 9 sqq.). It is in this fashion that He enters the city which was destined to reject Him, and which, because it rejected Him, was doomed (cf. Lk xix 41 sqq.). The Evangelist thinks of the whole episode as having been designed and arranged by Jesus in accordance with His insight into the purposes of God. The ass was provided and ready, as He knew that it would be; He foresaw that the protests of its owners would at once be abandoned when His message was given; and the ass was, as it happened, an animal meet for the service required of it, since it was a colt *whereon no man ever yet sat.*

It has been thought by J. Weiss, Bacon, Dalman,[1] and others that the Messianic colouring of the story was an afterthought (cf. Jn xii 16), and that the multitudes at the time greeted Jesus only as a Prophet. If he had really thus solemnly entered Jerusalem as the Messiah, why was not the fact brought up against Him at His trial? Even if the crowds did actually in a moment of enthusiasm hail Him as the Messiah (but see Mt xxi 10–11), the authorities appear to have made no capital out of the occurrence. 'It is hardly credible, therefore, that Jesus can have been the responsible author of the incident. If the facts really happened so, it must have been the result simply of what was done on the spur of the moment and attracted no particular attention' (Wellhausen). E. Meyer, on the other hand, thinks that Jesus was deliberately claiming to be the Messiah. 'Evidently He hoped, by means of a great demonstration on the part of His adherents, to win over the masses and secure the leading position in the city.'[2] Schweitzer is peculiar in thinking that the episode had a Messianic significance in the mind of our Lord Himself, but that the crowds looked upon Him rather as Elijah, the Fore-runner of the Messiah, than as the Messiah in person.[3]

On the whole, it seems to be the most probable conclusion that the entry in this peculiar fashion into Jerusalem was deliberate on the part of our Lord, and was meant to suggest that, though He was indeed the Messiah and 'Son of David', yet the Messiahship which He claimed was to be understood in a spiritual and non-political sense, in terms of the prophecy of Zechariah, rather than in terms of the 'Son of David' idea as interpreted by contemporary expectation (e. g. in the Psalms of Solomon). The time had in fact come for our Lord to put forward His Messianic claims, and to make His appeal to Jerusalem in a deliberately Messianic capacity. He does so, however, in a manner which is suggestive rather than explicit, and which was so calculated as to afford the minimum of pretext for a charge of quasi-political agitation. The Messianic ovation no doubt came rather from His own immediate followers than from the general population of Jerusalem, and was not of such a nature as to create a disturbance in the city. Nevertheless, a certain atmosphere of Messianic expectation was created, and rumours reached the authorities, although there was not as yet a basis for any very tangible accusation which would lie in a court of law. It is probable that the ass was borrowed from a village where our Lord already had friends, and that the owner readily lent it for the use of the Master. The suggestion of an apparently miraculous prevision on the part of our Lord is probably to be set down simply to the point of view from which the story is told by the Evangelist. It is to be remembered that it is quite arbitrary, and almost certainly unhistorical, to assume that our Lord had not visited Jerusalem hitherto. The accounts of the Passion in the Synoptic Gospels clearly imply that our Lord already possesses staunch friends both in Jerusalem and in the villages on the slopes of Mt. Olivet, as well as determined enemies in the city itself.

---

[1] Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* [E.T.], p. 222.
[2] E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* i, p. 163.
[3] Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* [E.T.], pp. 391 sqq.

1. *Bethphage and Bethany.* Of the two villages Bethphage was the nearer to Jerusalem. It is mentioned in the Talmud, but has not been certainly identified: it is, however, stated to have formed one of the limits of the Sabbatic zone round Jerusalem, and was therefore presumably less than a mile from the city.[1] The name *Bethphage* is said to mean 'House of Figs'. *Bethany* is to be identified with the modern *El-Azariyeh*, some fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem (Jn xi 18; and cf. the fourth-century *Peregrinatio Silviae*: 'Lazarium, id est, Bethania, est forsitan secundo miliario a civitate'). The name is said to mean 'House of Dates'. Figs and dates both grew freely on the slopes of Olivet. If the names of both villages stood in the true text of Mk, it is probable that *the village that is over against you* in verse 3 means Bethphage, the two disciples being sent on ahead from Bethany: there is some MS. authority for the omission of the words *Bethphage and* from the text, but they are probably authentic.

3. *The Lord hath need of him*: the phrase, so far as ordinary Gk. usage goes, need not mean more than 'the Master hath need of him': but *the Lord* was in Greek-speaking Christian usage a normal title of Jesus as the Divine 'Lord' of the Christian community, and it is probable that for the Evangelist, as certainly for his readers, the expression would be so understood in this passage (cf. v 19 and notes *ad loc.*). *And straightway he will send him back hither* should be read as part of our Lord's message, and is a promise that the animal, after the purpose for which it is being borrowed has been accomplished, shall be promptly returned. (In Mt xxi 3 the meaning is rather that the owner of the animal—or rather, as Mt has it by a false inference from a misunderstanding of Zech ix 9, of the *two* animals—will readily comply with our Lord's request.)

---

[1] A 'sabbath-day's journey' (cf. Acts i 12) was limited to 2,000 cubits, i. e. about 1,000 yards.

4. The R.V. translation is right here as against the A.V.

7. The ass is probably unsaddled: or alternatively, the garments are spread over the saddle to make a softer seat.

8. For the spreading of garments as a form of royal homage cf. 2 Kgs ix 13; for the description as a whole cf. the triumph of Judas Maccabaeus (1 Macc xiii 51). The *branches* (cf. R.V. mg.) are simply green litter from the fields. For 'palm-branches' the only authority is Jn xii 13. 118;

9. Cf. Ps cxviii 26. The proper translation of the verse as it stands in the Psalm is 'Blessed in the name of the Lord be he that cometh', and it is said to have been the ordinary greeting addressed to pilgrims arriving at the temple. It is nevertheless not impossible that Mk took it as meaning *he that cometh in the name of the Lord*, i. e. the Messiah who comes in the name of God. Bousset is of opinion that 'he that cometh' had become a veiled title of the expected Messiah as the result of a Messianic interpretation of the Psalm in question (cf. Mt xi 3, Lk vii 19, and perhaps also Mt iii 11).[1] *Hosanna* is properly speaking a prayer for help (*sc.* 'Save now!') addressed to God or to the King (cf. 2 Sam xiv 4, 2 Kgs vi 26). Mk (who need not have been an Hebraist) probably took it as meaning simply 'Hail!'

10. The crowds are looking primarily for a restoration of David's Kingdom. *Hosanna in the highest* probably means here simply 'Praise in high Heaven!' though the phrase could not have had this meaning in Hebrew: cf. Ps cxlviii 1, and see the discussion in Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* [E.T.], pp. 220 sqq.

11. Loisy is surely right, as against Holtzmann and others, in saying that the statement that Jesus *looked round about upon all things* does not mean that Mk thought of Him as a provincial seeing the Holy City and the Temple of God for the first time, but is merely meant to lead up to the episode of the expulsion of the traders from the Temple on the morrow. Mt and Lk drop out the intervening night and make Jesus cleanse the Temple forthwith. Mk thinks of the day as being already too far advanced for anything more than a preliminary look round with a view to action upon the morrow. Our Lord does not spend His nights in Jerusalem (cf. verse 19 *infra*), but is apparently staying with friends at Bethany (contrast Lk xxi 37).

12–14. *The barren fig tree*

(Cf. Mt xxi 18–19)

12 And on the morrow, when they were come out from
13 Bethany, he hungered. And seeing a fig tree afar off

---

[1] Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 4.

having leaves, he came, if haply he might find anything
thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but
14 leaves; for it was not the season of figs. And he answered
and said unto it, No man eat fruit from thee henceforward
for ever. And his disciples heard it.

This difficult story approximates more closely than any other episode in Mk to the type of 'unreasonable' miracle characteristic of the non-canonical Gospel literature.[1] Lk omits it, perhaps because he may have shared the view of some modern exegetes that it was sufficiently represented by the *parable* of the barren fig-tree, which presumably came to him from some other source (Lk xiii 6–9). The fig-tree in the parable is threatened with destruction, but reprieved in view of the pleading of the gardener, a figure which appears to represent a further opportunity of repentance for Israel. Now, however, doom approaches. Israel has *not* repented. It was but a short step to develop the parable further, and to represent the tree as definitely condemned. So J. Weiss, who thinks that, especially as events moved towards the crisis of A. D. 70, a legend arose about a fig-tree which Jesus had cursed and caused to wither, and perhaps also that some conspicuous withered tree on the road between Bethany and Jerusalem may have been popularly identified with the tree in question. E. Schwartz, who appears to have been the first to make this latter suggestion, refers also to Mk xiii 28 sqq., and thinks that the legend may have asserted that the fig-tree would eventually revive, and that the revival would be a sign of the Parousia. For the 'withered tree' metaphor cf. also Lk xxiii 31.

Those who regard the episode as having literally happened commonly explain it as an enacted parable, symbolic either of judgement on the fruitlessness of Jerusalem, or, more generally, of the judgement that must eventually fall on all spiritual promise without fulfilment. So (e.g.) Lagrange; but, as H. G. Wood points out, the story as told by Mk does not read like an acted parable. Bishop Gore, who accepts the story literally as 'a miracle of judgement very penetrating in its significance', thinks that Mk's explanatory phrase *for the time of figs was not yet* is misleading, and that 'what our Lord was apparently expecting to feed upon was the green knops (the 'green figs' of Cant ii 13) which appear on the fig-tree before the leaves, and without which any leafy fig-tree will, of course, be barren for the year. These green knops are, we are informed, still commonly eaten in Palestine.'[2] Lagrange, however, who speaks with the authority of long residence in Palestine, asserts roundly that green figs are quite inedible at any stage of their development, and that fruit ripe enough to eat could not possibly be found on a fig-tree before June. Residents in Palestine would know that figs could not be expected by Passover-time, and Mk, for the benefit of readers at Rome unfamiliar with the climate of the Levant, correctly explains the situation. Lagrange thinks our Lord did not seriously expect to find figs, but being hungry was reminded of figs by the sight of a fig-tree, and worked a symbolic miracle to teach the insufficiency of religious professions apart from the bringing forth of fruit. The disciples, he suggests, may have imagined that, the Messianic Age having begun, the trees might be expected to bear fruit all the year round, especially for the Messiah, and may have naïvely supposed our Lord also to have been of the same mind.

---

[1] For examples see M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 49 sqq., &c.
[2] Gore, *Belief in Christ*, p. 184.

15–19. *The cleansing of the Temple*

(Cf. Mt xxi 12–13; Lk xix 45–48; also Jn ii 13–17)

15 And they come to Jerusalem: and he entered into the
temple, and began to cast out them that sold and them that
bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the
money-changers, and the seats of them that sold the doves;
16 and he would not suffer that any man should carry a vessel
17 through the temple. And he taught, and said unto them,
Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer
for all the nations? but ye have made it a den of robbers.
18 And the chief priests and the scribes heard it, and sought
how they might destroy him: for they feared him, for all
the multitude was astonished at his teaching.
19 And every evening[1] he[2] went forth out of the city.

[1] Gr. *whenever evening came.*
[2] Some ancient authorities read *they.*

The cleansing of the Temple separates the doom pronounced on the barren fig-tree from its sequel in verses 20 sqq. (contrast Mt xxi 19 sqq.). For Mk's habit of thus intercalating one episode into the context of another see notes on iii 22–30 *supra.*

A market for the supply of sacrificial victims (the Evangelist refers especially to *doves*: cf. Lev xii 8, Lk ii 24, Lev xiv 22, xv 14, 29) and other materials for sacrifice (e. g. wine, oil, and salt) appears to have been carried on in the outermost court of the Temple (the 'Court of the Gentiles') under the sanction of the authorities. Lagrange compares the scenes at Mecca to-day, where the pilgrims are outrageously fleeced by the people of the country who sell them sheep for sacrifice. 'It is this fleecing of the people that Jesus seems to have especially condemned, as well as the resulting secularization of the sacred precincts. Instead of being impressed by the majesty of the place, and stirred by the realization of the Divine presence, the pilgrim found himself involved in a heated crowd, sellers intent only on getting the highest possible price, buyers protesting furiously against the sums demanded. The house of God, the precincts of which were meant to isolate it from the profanations of the world, had become the centre of an Oriental bazaar.' At the *tables of the money-changers* Jews from abroad were provided at a dear rate of exchange with the necessary half-shekel (cf. Ex xxx 12 sqq., Mt xvii 24) for the payment of the Temple tax, which seems at this time to have been payable only in coins of the Phoenician standard, the Tyrian two-drachma piece being the best type of 'half-shekel' available. On the traffic in the Temple see Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* i 114, 369 sqq.; Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* i 83 sqq.

The action of Jesus in driving out the crowd of buyers and sellers is prompted by zeal for the holiness of God's house, and not (as some scholars have erroneously supposed) by a desire to protest against the Temple worship and the sacrificial system as such, since for our Lord, as for S. Paul (Rom vii 12), the O.T. Law is *the commandment of God* (Mk vii 8; see also notes on i 40–45). It is an act of prophetic and super-prophetic authority: the implicit assertion, indeed, of the supreme authority of Jesus as the Messiah. We must suppose Him to have dominated the crowd of traffickers by moral and not by physical means: they simply quailed before His holy indignation. Mk only of the Evangelists states that He forbade the carrying of vessels through the Temple. Apparently this refers to the use of the Temple courts as a short cut from one part of the city to another. The practice had already been forbidden by Jewish law (cf. Josephus, *c. Apion.* ii 8), so that our Lord seems here to be merely reinforcing a recognized rule.

The Synoptic dating of this episode (which is not likely to have happened twice) seems preferable to the Johannine. It is possible that the Fourth Evangelist, writing after Jerusalem had fallen, introduces the story for symbolical reasons early in his Gospel: to him it suggested the mystical Body of Christ as the true Temple of God, which had been 'raised up' and substituted for the Judaism which had been destroyed (Jn ii 19–22; cf. E. C. Hoskyns, 'Adversaria Exegetica', in *Theology*, Sept. 1920).

17. Our Lord quotes Is lvi 7 and Jer vii 11. Mk alone gives the former quotation in full, i. e. with the addition of the words *for all the nations*, which in this context are specially appropriate, since it was in the Court of the Gentiles that the offending traffic was carried on. Jews only were allowed to penetrate beyond this outermost court of the Temple. The phrase from Jeremiah should be translated 'a brigands' cave'—an unexpectedly strong expression in this connexion.

18. By our Lord's action the Temple authorities were of course directly challenged. The Ober-Ammergau Passion Play is doubtless right in laying stress also upon the resentment of the outraged traders; cf. Lake, *The Stewardship of Faith*, p. 39, who thinks that financial interest was the real cause of the accusation subsequently brought against our Lord by the priests. For the present, in view of the popular enthusiasm, they content themselves with taking counsel behind the scenes.

19. R.V. text gives the correct reading here as against R.V. mg. It is uncertain whether our Lord stayed permanently at Bethany, as Mk probably supposed, or bivouacked with His disciples in the open on the slopes of Olivet, as seems to be suggested by Lk xxi 37. Jerusalem was overcrowded at Passover time, and accommodation for all the pilgrims in the city itself was not to be had. In our Lord's case there was a further motive, viz. the fact that in the city His life was in danger. J. Weiss notes that the traditional arrangement of the events in Jerusalem so as to fall on the successive days of Holy Week, leading up to Good Friday and Easter, rests wholly on the authority of Mk, and is obtained by reckoning backwards from Good Friday. Mt's omission of Mk xi 11 destroys the arrangement, which may perhaps be precarious in any case. The events need not all have happened in one week, and moreover, since Mk brings our Lord to Jerusalem only once in the course of his narrative, any Jerusalem episodes which he wished to include must of necessity find a place in the account of the visit in question.

20–25 (26). *On faith in God and confident prayer*

(Cf. Mt xxi 20–22, vi 14, xvii 20; Lk xvii 6)

20 And as they passed by in the morning, they saw the fig
21 tree withered away from the roots. And Peter calling to
remembrance saith unto him, Rabbi, behold, the fig tree
22 which thou cursedst is withered away. And Jesus answer-
23 ing saith unto them, Have faith in God. Verily I say unto
you, Whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou
taken up and cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his
heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass;
24 he shall have it. Therefore I say unto you, All things
whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye have
25 received them, and ye shall have them. And whensoever
ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any one;

that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses.[1]

[1] Many ancient authorities add verse 26, *But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses.*

Mk has used the withering of the fig-tree (regarded in the tradition which he followed as having been a literal occurrence) as a point of attachment for some traditional sayings of Jesus on the subject of prayer and faith in God. The connexion is awkwardly made, since the 'curse' pronounced upon the fig-tree was, as Loisy points out, strictly speaking neither a prayer nor an act of faith. But the Church in Apostolic days was familiar with 'miracles', and knew, too, that 'miracles' were wrought only through the agency of those who were conspicuously men of prayer and endowed with that 'supernatural' degree of faith which S. Paul counts among the more extraordinary of the Spirit's gifts (1 Cor xiii 2). It has been argued that the saying about the *mountain* being *cast into the sea* must have been uttered in Galilee on the mountainous shores of the Lake of Gennesaret; but it would be equally natural to think of the distant view of the Dead Sea from Mt. Olivet. The saying recurs, however, in substance in different contexts in Mt and Lk (Mt xvii 20, Lk xvii 6), and probably therefore stood in 'Q' as well as in Mk. It should of course be taken metaphorically, and the metaphor appears to have been proverbial. In Jewish writings a great teacher who explained satisfactorily difficult passages or apparent contradictions in Scripture was described as a 'mountain-remover'.[1] In the saying of our Lord we are to think generally of 'mountains' of difficulty. On verse 24 J. Weiss remarks that 'assuredly believers without number have relied upon these words and have found that their prayers were answered: but there is need of extremely strict self-examination and of a truly enlightened conscience before a man may presume to be so utterly sure of the help of God as is here implied. The phrase *believe that ye have received them*, i. e. that your request has been granted before ever your prayer is uttered, deserves to be noticed. The prayer, then, is after all not so much an attempt to bring influence to bear, so as to determine or alter God's purpose, as a trustful self-submission to God's hand.' H. G. Wood quotes Jeremy Taylor: 'Our desires are not to be the measure of our prayers, unless reason and religion be the rule of our desires.' As if to guard against the idea that the Divine resources available through prayer could be exploited for purposes other than those of love, Mk adds a saying about forgiveness (verse 25) which appears to be an echo of the Lord's Prayer. If so, it would appear that the phrase *your Father which is in heaven*, which elsewhere in the Gospels is distinctively Matthaean, already formed part of the Lord's Prayer as it stood in the form commonly used among Christians when Mk was writing: and it may therefore, despite its omission in Lk xi 2, have formed an original and authentic part of the prayer as taught by Jesus to His disciples. The thought that God's forgiveness is contingent upon man's forgiveness of his neighbour was not new in Judaism: cf. Ecclus xxviii 2. It is probable that verse 26 is rightly removed from the text of Mk by the Revisers. It is found in a number of MSS., but is probably an insertion from Mt vi 15.

---

[1] Strack and Billerbeck, *op. cit.* i 759.

27–33. *By what authority*

(Cf. Mt xxi 23–27 ; Lk xx 1–8)

27 And they come again to Jerusalem : and as he was walking
in the temple, there come to him the chief priests, and the
28 scribes, and the elders; and they said unto him, By what
authority doest thou these things? or who gave thee this
29 authority to do these things? And Jesus said unto them,
I will ask of you one question,[1] and answer me, and I will
30 tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism
of John, was it from heaven, or from men? answer me.
31 And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say,
From heaven; he will say, Why then did ye not believe
32 him? But [2] should we say, From men—they feared the
33 people: for [3] all verily held John to be a prophet. And they
answered Jesus and say, We know not. And Jesus saith
unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these
things.

[1] Gr. *word.*
[2] Or, *But shall we say, From men?*
[3] Or, *for all held John to be a prophet indeed.*

The courts and porches of the Temple were a recognized promenade; Jesus walks there, no doubt 'teaching', as Mt xxi 23 suggests. The deputation of *chief priests, scribes, and elders* is representative of the three divisions of the Sanhedrin (cf. viii 31). The question which they ask is a perfectly legitimate one from their point of view, since they are the constituted authorities responsible for public order in the Temple, and Jesus by His action in driving out the traders the day before had in a sense been usurping the functions of the Temple police. The form of their question contemplates two possibilities: (*a*) that Jesus may claim personal authority for Himself, or (*b*) that He may claim to be acting as the agent of some one else. Our Lord's answer takes the form of a counter-question, a method of reply not uncommon in Jewish religious discussions.[1] What is to be the verdict on *the baptism of John* (i. e. upon the activity, work, and mission of the Baptist)? Was it *from heaven* (i. e. from God), or *from men*? The question places our Lord's opponents in a dilemma, and they refuse to express an opinion. Our Lord consequently is released from His conditional promise to give a plain answer to their question, and refuses to do so. The real answer of Jesus is nevertheless contained by implication in the question which He had asked. For John had claimed to be a prophet sent from God, and the people had acknowledged him as such. The authority of Jesus is prophetic in type, like that of John. He too has His authority *from heaven*, and indeed (it is perhaps suggested) a fuller authority than that of John, since John had claimed to be the immediate herald of the Kingdom, and He who comes after John can be none other than the Messiah. Throughout these scenes at Jerusalem the Messianic claim of our Lord is steadily maintained and put forward by implication, though it is not until the actual trial-scene that, in reply to the High Priest's question (xiv 61, 62), the claim becomes explicit.

CHAPTER XII

1–12. *The wicked husbandmen*

(Cf. Mt xxi 33–46; Lk xx 9–19)

1 And he began to speak unto them in parables. A man
planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged
a pit for the winepress, and built a tower, and let it out to
2 husbandmen, and went into another country. And at the
season he sent to the husbandmen a servant,[1] that he might
receive from the husbandmen of the fruits of the vineyard.
3 And they took him, and beat him, and sent him away
4 empty. And again he sent unto them another servant;
and him they wounded in the head, and handled shame-
5 fully. And he sent another; and him they killed: and
6 many others; beating some, and killing some. He had yet
one, a beloved son: he sent him last unto them, saying,
7 They will reverence my son. But those husbandmen said

[1] Gr. *bondservant.*

---

[1] Examples in Strack and Billerbeck, *op. cit.* i, pp. 861–862.

among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him,
8 and the inheritance shall be ours. And they took him, and
9 killed him, and cast him forth out of the vineyard. What
therefore will the lord of the vineyard do? he will come
and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard
10 unto others. Have ye not read even this scripture;
The stone which the builders rejected,
The same was made the head of the corner:
11 This was from the Lord,
And it is marvellous in our eyes?
12 And they sought to lay hold on him; and they feared the
multitude; for they perceived that he spake the parable
against them: and they left him, and went away.

Verses 10, 11: cf. Ps. cxviii 22, 23.

This story may possibly, as Loisy suggests,[1] have stood last, as the parable of the Sower appears to have stood first, in some early collection of the parables of our Lord; but though intelligible as a story,[2] it appears to be clearly an allegory rather than a parable proper, and an allegory, moreover, of which the meaning is sufficiently transparent to be immediately intelligible. Those critics, accordingly, who, accepting rigidly the principle of Jülicher,[3] suppose that our Lord *never* employed allegory, conclude not unnaturally that this particular 'parable' is rather a symbolic exposition of early Church doctrine than an actual utterance of Jesus. It is argued, moreover, that the allegory presupposes Christ's death, that the punishment of the murderers envisages the destruction of Jerusalem, and, further, that the story embodies too emphatic an expression of the Messianic claim to be ascribed in this context to our Lord.

Nevertheless, all such arguments, however superficially plausible, are highly precarious. It is not necessary to press Jülicher's distinction between parable and allegory so far as to deny that our Lord *may* have occasionally used allegory; it is morally certain, not only that

---

[1] Loisy, *Les Evangiles Synoptiques* i, p. 730.

[2] This is sometimes denied: but a wealthy landowner (not necessarily a Jew, and resident perhaps in Rome) might quite well possess vineyards in Palestine let out on the *métayer* system to local cultivators, whose reception of the successive slaves sent to collect the produce reflects not unfaithfully the occasional difficulties attending the collection of rents in the East. The murder of the heir with a view to the seizure of the property presumably implies that the husbandmen wrongly supposed the owner to be dead. They discover their mistake, since the owner, arriving in person, takes vengeance upon them, no doubt by invoking the strong arm of the Roman authorities.

[3] See notes on iv 1–2 a *supra*.

He foresaw and anticipated His death, but that He regarded Himself as occupying a position higher than that of the prophets, as not only a 'servant' but a 'son' in relation to God; and the whole narrative in Mk of the events in Jerusalem implies that He is persistently challenging the authorities and putting forward His claims, indirectly but definitely, precisely as He is represented here. In particular, the argument based on the apparent allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem proves too much, since it is probable that Mk was in any case written before Jerusalem fell. Apart from this, our Lord seems clearly to have elsewhere anticipated the doom of the city (cf. xiii 1 sqq.), and the allusion is by no means a certain one here, since the punishment of the murderers might be taken simply as the natural conclusion of the story, with no allegorical reference. The authenticity of the parable has been strongly defended by Burkitt, who argues that an allegory which was the free composition of primitive Christianity would certainly have foreshadowed the resurrection, and not merely the death, of the 'Heir'.[1]

The parable is in effect, as Lagrange rightly points out, a supreme appeal to the conscience of our Lord's opponents, reminding them of God's infinite patience shown towards the Jewish race, and of His justice too, by which they themselves were threatened. 'It would have been a reflection on our Lord's own moral character if He had *not* set clearly before His adversaries the blackness of the crime which they were plotting and its consequences. What moreover gives to the parable its special appropriateness to the precise situation in which it is uttered is the care which our Lord takes not to involve the crowd, still sympathetic towards Him, in the guilt of the authorities and in their punishment. The vineyard, which more or less directly stands for the people, is neither guilty nor threatened. S. Peter on the other hand, in the Acts, except when directly addressing the Sanhedrin (Acts iv 10–11, v 30–31), draws no such distinction: he accuses the Jewish people as a whole of the judicial murder of our Lord (Acts ii 22–23, iii 15), the reason being that the situation had changed since the time when this parable was spoken. Loisy therefore is wrong in refusing to see in the parable any "fine psychological insight".'

Attached to the parable as it now stands, but separable from it, is a reference to Ps cxviii 22, 23, a passage which, as commonly interpreted, applies originally to Israel, despised amongst the nations, but nevertheless divinely destined to pre-eminence; though if the Psalm be of Maccabaean date (as Duhm believes) it may have referred rather to the beginnings of the Maccabaean house, opposed by the High Priest Alcimus (1 Macc vii 5, 9, 12, 25), and yet destined to become the corner-stone of the national and religious restoration. The passage is quoted elsewhere in the N.T. (Acts iv 11; 1 Peter ii

---

[1] F. C. Burkitt in *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religion* ii, pp. 321–328.

4, 7; cf. Rom ix 32, 33, Eph ii 20, where reference is made to the kindred passage Is xxviii 16) and appears to have been a favourite 'proof-text' of early Christian apologetic. The Church saw in it a prophetic word fulfilled in the spiritual triumph and exaltation of the Messiah who had been rejected by the priests. As here applied it completes the symbolism of the parable from the Christian point of view, by supplying under a different figure the missing reference to the Resurrection. It does not follow that this use of it was simply an afterthought of early Christian O.T. exegesis: it is equally possible that the Messianic application of the Psalmist's words goes back, as the Gospels suggest, to our Lord Himself.

1. *In parables*: cf. iii 23; also Ps lxxviii 2 (= lxxvii 2 LXX). Mt and Lk both modify the wording, and the former introduces at this point more parables than one. But the phrase in Mk means simply 'parabolically', and is equivalent to an adverb (cf. Mt xxii 1). The opening words of the parable are based upon Is v 2 sqq., and suggest already the allegorical reference to Israel as the Vineyard of the Lord. The details, on the other hand, except as indicating the Owner's care for His possession, are not in any allegorical sense significant. Vineyards in Palestine are surrounded by a *hedge*—usually a wall of unmortared stones. The *pit for the winepress* would be a trough hewn out in the solid rock, in which the grapes were trodden, a smaller cavity being hewn out also in the rock below into which the juice was allowed to run. A *tower* of unmortared stone would be built also, probably in the form of a kind of upper story to the winepress. It served as a store-room for the new-made wine, and the flat roof would be used by the watchman on guard against the inroads of jackals (cf. Song of Songs ii 15) or of thieves.

2. *At the season*: this would be in the fifth year (Lev xix 23–25).

4. *Wounded in the head*: so the Vulgate (*in capite vulneraverunt*). The verb in Gk. is difficult, and occurs only here. It is probable that R.V. and Vulg. interpret rightly.

5. For the maltreatment of the successive 'servants' cf. 1 Kgs xviii 13, xxii 27; 2 Chron xxiv 20 sqq., xxxvi 15 sqq.; Neh ix 26; Mt xxiii 34 sqq.; Lk xi 49 sqq.; Mt xxiii 37; Lk xiii 33–34.

6. *He had yet one, a beloved son*: The Messiah is both 'servant' (cf. x 45 and notes *ad loc.*; also Acts iii 13, 26, iv 27, 30 R.V.), and also more than a 'servant', viz. a *son* (cf. Heb. i 2). For the epithet *beloved* (= 'only-begotten', cf. Jdgs xi 34 LXX) see notes on i 11 *supra*.

7. *Inheritance*, here equivalent to 'possession'; cf. Dt. ix 26, xxxii 9; Pss xxviii 9, xxxiii 12, lxviii 9, ii 8. For *come, let us kill him* cf. Gen. xxxvii 20.

8. The murderers throw the body outside the vineyard, and expose it without burial. Mt and Lk both modify, in the interests of a more complete allegorical correspondence with the crucifixion of Jesus outside the walls of Jerusalem (cf. Heb. xiii 12 sq.), by saying that they cast him out and (subsequently) slew him.

9. If the details are to be pressed, this verse might be taken to suggest the transference of authority from the chief priests and scribes to the Twelve as the new 'judges' of God's spiritual 'Israel' (so, e. g., Gore, *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 46; cf. Mt xix 28, Lk xxii 30). But it is doubtful whether anything so specific is here intended.

10. *Even this scripture*, i. e. such a well-known passage as the following. For commentary on the quotation see above.

11. This verse is singularly apt as a Christian comment on the Resurrection, less immediately appropriate in the mouth of our Lord; though of course it may be added simply as the natural completion of the quotation.

12. Cf. xi 18 *supra*.

13–17. *The Tribute-money*

(Cf. Mt xxii 15–22; Lk xx 20–26)

13 And they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the
14 Herodians, that they might catch him in talk. And when
they were come, they say unto him, Master,[1] we know that
thou art true, and carest not for any one: for thou regardest
not the person of men, but of a truth teachest the way of
God: Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?
15 Shall we give, or shall we not give? But he, knowing
their hypocrisy, said unto them, Why tempt ye me? bring
16 me a penny,[2] that I may see it. And they brought it. And
he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscrip-
17 tion? And they said unto him, Caesar's. And Jesus said
unto them, Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's,
and unto God the things that are God's. And they mar-
velled greatly at him.

[1] Or, *Teacher*.
[2] The word in the Greek denotes a coin worth about eightpence-halfpenny.

The word translated *tribute* is in the original Greek a transliteration of the Latin *census*: a variant reading in D and certain other authorities gives the meaning 'head-tax'. The reference is to a tax amounting, apparently, to a *denarius*[1] per head, which had been levied by the Imperial Government upon the population of Judaea ever since A. D. 6, when Archelaus, son of Herod the Great, was deposed for misgovernment, and Idumaea, Samaria, and Judaea became a Roman province under a *procurator Caesaris*. The tax was unpopular, and provoked, when it was first levied, the revolt of Judas the Gaulonite, known as Judas the Galilaean (Acts v 37; cf. Josephus, *Antiquities* xviii 1, 6). The revolt was crushed, but the ideas for which Judas stood did not die with him. It is significant that Josephus regards him as having been in some sense the author of the 'fourth sect of Jewish philosophy'—that of the Zealots—even though it was only in the days of Gessius Florus (the last procurator of Judaea, appointed in A.D. 64) that 'the nation began to grow mad with this distemper'.[1] The tribute was hated because it was the badge of servitude to Rome. 'Did the battle-cry of Judas, "No tribute to the Romans", ever die out in Jesus' life-time? . . . The Pharisees knew just how to shatter the faith in Jesus as the Messiah. For indeed all they had to ask Him was the question whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Caesar. The Messiah that was to deliver the children of Israel from the Caesars and all oppression, that Messiah could not command them to pay the tribute.'[2] So *they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians, that they might catch him in talk.* And the dilemma consisted in the fact that if He declared the payment of the tribute religiously *lawful*, His popularity with the multitudes would be at an end: if He declared it unlawful, His questioners would be in a position to delate Him to the Government as a fomenter of revolution. The Lord's answer is an evasion of the dilemma, except in so far as by it He makes it clear that He is no political revolutionary. He expresses no opinion as to the theoretical rightfulness or wrongfulness of Caesar's rule. According to the ancient way of thinking, the authority of a ruler was co-extensive with the circulation of his money as *de facto* 'coin of the realm',[3] and coins were regarded as being ultimately the private property of the sovereign whose image they bore. Since Caesar's coins were in actual circulation, our Lord argues, the Jews in paying tribute were only giving to Caesar that which was his own. There was no conflict between that and their duty to God. It is probable that at the time our Lord did not mean more than this. It is a mistake to read into His words a recognition, such as we find in the Roman citizen S. Paul, of the divine authority, within his own sphere, of the temporal ruler as such (Rom xiii 1 sqq.). At the same time the interest of the story for Mk's Roman readers would no doubt lie in the fact that our Lord's words could be read in the Pauline sense, and could be used to defend *Christianity* from the charge of being disloyal to the State. The saying has of course exercised an enormous influence historically. H. G. Wood quotes Lord Acton as saying of it 'Those words . . . gave to the civil power, under the protection of conscience, a sacredness it had never enjoyed and bounds it had never acknowledged: and they were the repudiation of absolutism and the inauguration of freedom'. The attitude of our Lord's questioners themselves towards the payment of tribute was presumably not very different from that of Jesus. On the Jewish solution of the problem see Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* i, pp. 62 sqq.

---

[1] In value nearer a shilling than a 'penny': see R.V. mg.

---

[1] Josephus, *Ant.* xviii 1, 6.

[2] V. G. Simkhovitch, *Towards the Understanding of Jesus*, pp. 37, 80.

[3] Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T.* i, p. 884.

13. *The Herodians.* There is no real evidence that these constituted a distinct 'party' among the Jews: see note on iii 6 *supra.* Was Herod himself in Jerusalem at this time (see Lk xxiii 6–15, and cf. B. H. Streeter, *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 229 sqq.)? If so, it is intelligible that Herodian officials should be brought to listen to what one of Herod's subjects, who was suspected of putting forward a claim to be the Messiah, would say in reply to a question which was meant to test his political attitude.

14. The preamble to their question is at once a hypocritical *captatio benevolentiae* and a reluctant testimony to the impression made by the character of Jesus. *The way of God* = Religion. Cf. the Jewish document known as 'The Two Ways' incorporated in the Epistle of Barnabas (Barn xviii sqq.; cf. also *Didache* i).

15. Translate and punctuate 'Bring me a *denarius.* Let me look at it.' It is not implied that our Lord had never seen a Roman coin hitherto; but He does not possess one.

16. For a reproduction of the devices on the obverse and reverse of a *denarius* of Tiberius see No. 13 on the plate showing *Coins current in Palestine* in *H. D. B.* s.v. *Money.* The copper coins of smaller denominations minted locally for use in Palestine had no representations of living creatures, in deference to Jewish susceptibilities, and were without the Emperor's head. The poll-tax, however, had to be paid in silver *denarii* of the Empire. Schürer appears to be wrong in speaking of the 'undoubtedly Greek' inscription upon the coins of Caesar;[1] the true *denarius* had a *Latin* inscription. The *drachmae* with Greek inscriptions issued by the Antiochene mint were not valid for the payment of the poll-tax, though for all other purposes they passed by imperial ordinance for *denarii.*

17. E. A. Abbott thinks there is a reference to the thought of Gen i 26, 27, and that our Lord means that the coins stamped with Caesar's image are to be rendered to Caesar, those stamped with God's image to God, i. e. that man's true offering to God is the offering of himself.[2] But this seems too subtle to be the immediate sense of the passage.

---

[1] Schürer, *Jewish People* [E.T.] II i 50. Dalman in *Jesus-Jeschua* takes the same view, viz. that the inscription on the coin would be in Greek (*op. cit.*, p. 2).

[2] E. A. Abbott, *Miscellanea Evangelica* ii 76 sqq.

18–27. *The Question of the Sadducees*

(Cf. Mt xxii 23–33; Lk xx 27–40)

18 And there come unto him Sadducees, which say that there
19 is no resurrection; and they asked him, saying, Master,[1]
Moses wrote unto us, If a man's brother die, and leave
a wife behind him, and leave no child, that his brother
should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother.
20 There were seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and
21 dying left no seed; and the second took her, and died,
22 leaving no seed behind him; and the third likewise: and
the seven left no seed. Last of all the woman also died.
23 In the resurrection whose wife shall she be of them? for the
24 seven had her to wife. Jesus said unto them, Is it not for
this cause that ye err, that ye know not the scriptures, nor
25 the power of God? For when they shall rise from the
dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but
26 are as angels in heaven. But as touching the dead, that
they are raised; have ye not read in the book of Moses, in
the place concerning the Bush, how God spake unto him,
saying, I *am* the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac,
27 and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but
of the living: ye do greatly err.

Verse 19: cf. Dt xxv 5, 6. Verse 26: cf. Ex iii 6.

---

[1] Or, *Teacher*.

The *Sadducees* are only here directly mentioned in Mk. They were the aristocratic and priestly party of the period, as contrasted with the Pharisees, who were the popular party (Josephus, *Antiquities* xviii i 4). The name is derived most probably from Zadok, priest in the time of David (2 Sam viii 17, &c.), from whom the priesthood of later days appears to have claimed descent. It is a mistake to think of them as having been irreligious or 'worldly', except in so far as they tended, in common with highly placed ecclesiastics in other periods of history, to have a horror of fanaticism and to distrust popular movements of religious enthusiasm. They were essentially the conservative party in Judaism; accepting as authoritative the canonical Scriptures, and especially the Law, they rejected both the Pharisaic oral traditions (see notes on vii 1–23 *supra*), and also the lately developed doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, the vogue of which within Judaism dated from the period of the Maccabaean martyrdoms (cf. 2 Macc xii 43, 44, vii 9, 14; Dan xii 2). On the latter point our Lord emphatically sided with the Pharisees, though He agreed with the Sadducees against the Pharisees in their view of the Law. Mk introduces the present episode at this particular point, perhaps because he wished to exhibit our Lord in controversy with the Sadducees immediately after His conflict with the Pharisees. From the point of view of his Roman readers, moreover, the incident will have had value as suggesting (like S. Paul's argument in 1 Cor xv) a spiritual view of the resurrection in answer to crudely materialistic difficulties, such as were widely felt in the Gentile world. For the benefit of such Roman readers it is explained in verse 18 that the Sadducees were deniers of the resurrection. In Rabbinical tradition the denial of the tenet in question is carried back to the disciples of a certain Antigonus of Socho (*circa* 150 B.C.). In the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature the deniers of the resurrection are described as the 'impious' or 'godless ones'; no doubt the Sadducees are meant, but the language is simply that of controversial abuse. For Jewish views of the nature of the resurrection life see Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* i, pp. 168 sqq.

The Sadducees here bring forward in the form of a question addressed to Jesus what is probably one of their stock arguments from Scripture against the idea of a resurrection of the dead. The Law, it is contended, can have contemplated no such resurrection, otherwise—in view of the provisions of Dt xxv 5–10—some very absurd situations must necessarily result. The difficulty is put in the form of an ironical request for light upon the subject. Our Lord replies that they understand neither the Scriptures to which they appeal, nor the power of God whose resources are not confined within the narrow limits of Sadducaean imagination. The purpose of marriage on its physical side is to continue the race (and that was more particularly the case with the law of Levirate marriage to which the Sadducees appealed—see below): but this is wholly relative to life in a world subjected to the prevalence of death. Where death is abolished, marriage (physically considered) and birth will be also abolished. Those who attain to the resurrection will be in this respect *as angels in heaven* (cf. the address to the Fallen Angels in Enoch: 'But you were [formerly] spiritual, living the eternal life, and immortal for all generations of the world. And therefore I have not appointed wives for you: for as for the spiritual ones of the heaven, in heaven is their dwelling.')[1] Our Lord adds a general argument of a positive kind, based on the fact that in Ex iii 6 God is represented as being still the God of the ancient patriarchs, despite the fact of their decease. It is possible that this was a stock argument of the Pharisees, since it occurs in 4 Macc vii 19, xvi 25.[1] To modern minds it is hardly cogent, inasmuch as (1) it reads into the words of Scripture a meaning which they were not historically intended to bear, and (2) at the most it could be taken to suggest that the departed are 'alive unto God'; it is an argument for life after death, rather than strictly for resurrection.

---

[1] Eth. Enoch xv 6, 7 (in R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.* ii 198).

Apparently it carried with it by implication the hope of a resurrection for Jewish minds. Nevertheless, our Lord's words, more broadly considered, do give expression to what is probably the strongest of all purely rational arguments for the life of the world to come, viz. that based on the reality of the religious life and the goodness of God. As Loisy expresses it, 'God cannot have ceased to be the God of those who have served and loved Him and who have been the recipients of His favour.'

19. The Deuteronomic law of Levirate marriage was no doubt based upon a much more ancient popular religious custom which went back originally to the notion that it was the worst of misfortunes to die without posterity, since there would be no one to perform the filial duty of making offerings to propitiate the dead man's ghost. But this original significance of the custom was no longer operative in historical times among the Hebrews. The regulation of Dt only applied in cases in which the dead man and his brother had shared the same roof. Wellhausen thinks that by the time of our Lord the law in question had become virtually obsolete. The case propounded by the Sadducees is no doubt an imaginary one, a problem invented for the purposes of controversy.

21–22. The fact that all the marriages proved childless is essential: if a child had at any stage been born, presumably the woman would have been reckoned the wife of the husband by whom she had the child, though the child would have been regarded from the point of view of the Levirate law as the child of the original husband.

26. The Pentateuch is cited as *the book of Moses*, and the particular passage as *the Bush*. For this method of citing, cf. 'in Elijah' (Rom xi 2, R.V. mg.).

28–34. *The Greatest Commandment*

(Cf. Mt xxii 34–40; Lk x 25–28)

28 And one of the scribes came, and heard them questioning together, and knowing that he had answered them well,
29 asked him, What commandment is the first of all? Jesus

---

[1] Text in English in R. H. Charles, *op. cit.* ii, pp. 675, 682. The date of 4 Macc is uncertain, but it appears to have been written before A. D. 70, and may be as early as B. C. 63.

answered, The first is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God,[1]
30 the Lord is one: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God
with[2] all thy heart, and with[2] all thy soul, and with[2] all
31 thy mind, and with[2] all thy strength. The second is this,
Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none
32 other commandment greater than these. And the scribe
said unto him, Of a truth, Master,[3] thou hast well said that
33 he is one; and there is none other but he: and to love him
with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and
with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself,
is much more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices.
34 And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said
unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.
And no man after that durst ask him any question.

Verses 29, 33: cf. Dt vi 4, 5. Verses 31, 33: cf. Lev xix 18. Verse 32: cf. Dt iv 35. Verse 33: cf. 1 Sam xv 22.

[1] Or, *The Lord is our God; the Lord is one.*
[2] Gr. *from.*
[3] Or, *Teacher.*

The Rabbis calculated that the Law contained 365 prohibitions and 248 positive commands, and Jewish literature affords several examples of attempts to sum up in the shortest possible form its fundamental principle or principles, of which the most famous is R. Hillel's reply to a would-be proselyte, viz. 'That which thou hatest (to be done to thyself) do not to thy fellow; this is the whole law; the rest is commentary; go and learn it.' Our Lord was probably not the first to associate Dt vi 4 with Lev xix 18 as a summary statement of the Law; the love of God is similarly linked with the love of one's neighbour in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*,[1] and in Lk x 27 the words here ascribed to our Lord are credited to 'a certain lawyer'. Abrahams in an important essay on *The Greatest Commandment*[2] remarks that in Jewish distinctions between commandments as being respectively 'light' and 'heavy', 'great' and 'small', the idea was to formulate basic principles from which the rest of the Law could be deduced as a corollary: it was not meant to be suggested that provided the 'great' commandments were kept, the rest of the Law might be ignored. Accordingly 'in Jewish theology an objection was raised to such summaries just because they would tend to throw stress on part of the Torah to the relative detriment of the rest'. Abrahams thinks that 'the questioner of Jesus desired an opinion as to whether Jesus did or did not share this fear of reducing the Law to fundamental rules'. The importance of our Lord's reply, therefore, lay not so much in the formulation of the two Great Commandments (which may have been already current as a summary of the Law) as in the fact that He *did* distinguish between 'weightier matters' and matters less weighty. And the importance of the episode from the standpoint of the Evangelist lay precisely in the fact that the Christian Church had drawn the inference which Judaism refused to draw, viz. that provided the spirit of the Law, as thus summed up, were kept, all else might be ignored. It was in this fashion that the Christian Church, in its Gentile-Christian form, was able to reconcile in one religious system the retention as sacred Scripture of the Old Testament, in which the Law was set forth as God's revealed will for His people, with the Pauline principle that the Law nevertheless was not binding upon Christians of Gentile descent.

---

[1] *Test. Dan.* v 3; *Test. Issachar* v 2, vii 6. The text of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* contains some manifestly Christian interpolations, but the work as a whole dates probably from the first century B.C.

[2] *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* i 18 sqq.

The story as Mk gives it is no doubt a variant of that of Lk x 25 sqq., and many critics are disposed to prefer the Lucan form, and in any case to doubt whether the Marcan context is right. The concluding comment, *And no man after that durst ask him any question*, might at first sight appear to be more in place after the last controversial encounter between our Lord and His adversaries, and the conversation here with the scribe is not controversial, but is rather a friendly discussion. (It is noteworthy that this is the case only in Mk: contrast Mt xxii 35, Lk x 25.) It is likely enough that, here as elsewhere, the arrangement of Mk's materials is due to the Evangelist; but Mk clearly appears to have thought of the conversation with the scribe as a real climax, not of controversy, but in respect of the effect which it produced. The way in which our Lord dealt with this friendly inquirer, culminating in the solemn pronouncement *Thou art not far from the kingdom of God*, produced such an impression of religious awe upon the bystanders that no one after that ventured any more to take the initiative in questioning our Lord.

28. The Greek word rendered *what* means strictly 'what sort of'; but it is probably a mistake here to press the literal meaning. *First* here of course means 'first in importance'. Mt xxii 36 has literally 'What commandment is *great* in the Law?' a form which Abrahams prefers, on the ground of the Hebraic use of the positive for the superlative.

29. Our Lord quotes the passage which formed the opening words of the *Shema* (a combination of Dt vi 4–9 with Dt xi 13–21, and Num xv 37–41), recited daily by strict Jews, worn on the person in phylacteries (cf. Mt xxiii 5), and affixed in small tubes to the doorpost of their doors (cf. Dt vi 9, and see Oesterley and Box, *Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp. 454–455). Mk alone gives the

opening affirmation of monotheism—a doctrine which the Church in a Gentile atmosphere could by no means afford to take for granted. *With all thy mind* is not in the Hebrew, except in so far as it may be regarded as an alternative rendering of the phrase represented by *with all thy heart.* The Hebrew word for *heart* is thus variously rendered in different MSS. of the LXX.

31. As Dt vi 4 can be regarded as summing up the first 'table' of the Decalogue, so Lev xix 18 sums up in general terms the principle of the second 'table'. J. Weiss justly points out that while religious teachers, in emphasizing the importance of 'religious duties' in the narrower sense of the words, may have occasionally conveyed the impression that the love of God might be separated from the love of one's neighbour, the modern tendency by way of reaction to substitute philanthropy for religion is at least equally far from the mind of Christ. Our Lord placed the love of God first, but held that there could be no true love of God without love of the brethren. 'Christianity in the full sense cannot exist without *both* the love of God *and* the love of one's neighbour.'

33. Cf. Hos vi 6; 1 Sam xv 22, &c. The sentiment is Jewish enough. At the same time the fact that Christianity, unlike Judaism, was actually unencumbered by any practice of animal sacrifice was of enormous advantage from the missionary point of view, since it enabled Christian preachers to accommodate themselves to the educated standpoint of contemporary Stoic and neo-Pythagorean philosophers (who criticized animal sacrifices on rational grounds), by emphasizing the character of Christian worship as a *rationabile obsequium*, a worship rationally rendered by rational creatures to their Creator (cf. Rom xii 1). So here it is perhaps significant that the scribe is said to have answered *discreetly* (lit. 'in the manner of one possessed of reason').

34. It is argued by some commentators that the phrase *kingdom of God* is here used in a non-eschatological sense to denote a present fact, or even a state of mind. But need the phrase mean more than simply 'You come near possessing the qualifications needed for entry into the Kingdom'? J. Weiss' comment on the words is to the effect that 'the imagery according to which the Kingdom of God is the goal of a pilgrimage, some men being farther advanced on the way thither than others, is found also elsewhere in the Gospels (cf. Mt xxi 31). But this is without prejudice to the fundamental conception that the Kingdom of God is primarily something that comes down to men from on high.'

35–37. *David's Son and David's Lord*

(Cf. Mt xxii 41–46; Lk. xx 41–44)

35 And Jesus answered and said, as he taught in the temple, How say the scribes that the Christ is the son of David?

36 David himself said in the Holy Spirit,
The Lord said unto my Lord,
Sit thou on my right hand,
Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.[1]
37 David himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he his son? And the common people[2] heard him gladly.

Verse 36: cf. Ps. cx 1.

---

[1] Some ancient authorities read *underneath thy feet*.
[2] Or, *the great multitude*.

Psalm cx is an honorific ode addressed to some Jewish ruler who combined in his own person the offices of priest and king, and who for that reason is compared to Melchizedek (cf. Gen xiv 18). The initial letters of the verses in Hebrew suggest an acrostic on the name Symeon, and it has been thought that the original reference may have been to Simon Maccabaeus, 'high priest and Friend of kings' (1 Macc xiii 36). The Psalm is here quoted as referring to the Messiah, and—on the assumption, universally current in our Lord's day, that the Psalms were the work of David—it is argued that since David refers to the expected Messiah as 'Lord', it can be no adequate account of Him to say that He is merely 'David's Son'. As commonly interpreted, this means that our Lord is using a Scriptural argument, based upon premisses which those around Him would not question, and which were probably not questioned by Himself (for it was no part of the meaning of the Incarnation that the Lord's human mind should be possessed of miraculous information about matters of historical fact), in order to draw people's minds away from the merely nationalistic associations of the title 'Son of David', and to suggest that a deeper insight into the Scriptures pointed to an even higher role for the expected Christ, a role in which the Messiah would be not merely David's Son but David's Lord.

Bousset and others find it difficult to think that this 'argument with the scribes' goes back to our Lord Himself. 'Are we really to suppose that Jesus by this mysterious exegesis of Psalm cx wishes to let the scribes into the secret of His Messianic consciousness after having deliberately evaded their question as to His authority? Or can one believe that Jesus, apart from any reference to His own person, wishes to give the scribes a proof of His exegetical skill? Or even admitting that Jesus already regards Himself as the "Lord" of the Psalms and allows this idea to enter into the question He puts to the scribes, there remains the difficulty of the way in which it is done, the introduction of this His amazing secret just in order to propound an insoluble riddle to His opponents. . . . All becomes clear when we suppose that we have here, not *ipsissima verba* of

Jesus, but the theology of the earliest community.'[1] Similarly, J. Weiss: 'There clearly lies before us here an interesting protest on the part of the earliest community against the all too earthly Jewish Messianic ideal of the Son of David.'[2]

There is probably a half-truth in the remark of Weiss: the 'Son of David' title, taken by itself, no doubt did tend to suggest too political a conception of the Messiahship. It is indeed improbable that Bousset and Weiss are right in thinking that the applicability of the title 'Son of David' to our Lord is here simply denied: this particular passage, taken by itself, might be read in that sense; but the title 'Son of David' as applied to our Lord is too deeply rooted elsewhere in the Christian tradition,[3] and it is probable that our Lord too regarded Himself as in some sense Son of David.[4] What is true is that our Lord could not consent to be regarded as 'Son of David' in the *popular* sense. He was indeed 'Son of David', but He was only 'Son of David' with a difference.

The force, on the other hand, of the argument quoted *supra* from Bousset depends largely upon the assumption that the question here ascribed to our Lord is addressed to the scribes, which in Mk xii 35 (contrast Mt xxii 41) is by no means the case. Our Lord is no longer arguing with the scribes, He is *teaching in the Temple*. He addresses Himself to the people, with the object of criticizing and modifying the conception of Messiahship which had become lodged in their minds as the result of the ordinary teaching of the scribes. There is nothing impossible in the supposition that He may have actually done so. The application of Psalm cx to our Lord is indeed prominent in the apologetic and theology of the earliest Church: it is regarded as prophetic in Acts ii 34 of the Ascension, in Heb x 12, 13 of the session at the 'right hand' of the Father, in Heb vi 20, vii 17, 21 of the eternal High Priesthood 'after the order of Melchizedek': and in the present passage of Mk it is probably valued by the Evangelist as affording a justification from Scripture of the use of the title 'Lord' in relation to Jesus—a title which very early became the characteristic description of Jesus in Gentile Christianity.[5] But the very prominence and earliness of such applications of the Psalm in primitive Christian thought may not improbably have been due to the remembered fact that Jesus Himself had once quoted it and endorsed the interpretation of it in a Messianic sense. Later Judaism appears to have regarded this Psalm as referring either to King Hezekiah (cf. Justin, *Dialogue*, 33, 83) or to Abraham (so the great Jewish commentator Rashi). But this is probably because the Messianic interpretation had been exploited by Christianity. That the Psalm was at one time Messianically interpreted by the Jews is clear from a passage in the Midrash on Ps xviii 36, where Ps cx 1 is quoted by way of illustration in a Messianic sense (see Oesterley and Box, *Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, p. 97).

---

[1] W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 43.

[2] *S. N. T.* i 189.

[3] Cf. Bishop Chase, *Belief and Creed*, p. 61.

[4] See Additional Notes, pp. 253, 255.

[5] Cf. notes on i 1, v 19, 20, xi 3; also Introduction, p. li.

35. *How say the scribes*? i.e. 'What do the scribes mean when they say . . . ?'

36. *In the Holy Spirit*, i.e. writing under inspiration as a prophet (cf. Acts ii 30). *The Lord said, &c.* On the probability that our Lord in quoting used the accustomed Jewish paraphrase, *sc.* 'The Name', instead of actually pronouncing the sacred Tetragrammaton, see Dalman, *Words of Jesus* [E.T.], p. 182. *The footstool of thy feet.* There is strong MS. authority for the marginal reading *underneath thy feet.* If mg. is right, there appears to be a reminiscence of Ps viii 6. Early Christianity saw in Ps viii a Scriptural justification of the title 'Son of Man' as applied to our Lord, as in Ps cx a justification of the title 'Lord'.

37. *Whence is he his son?* It is worth noticing that the writer of the Epistle of Barnabas agreed with some modern scholars in thinking that the Davidic Sonship is here definitely denied (cf. Ep. Barn. xii 10). But in view of what is said above, it is better to take the words as meaning 'In what sense, then, is he his son?' *The common people heard him gladly* must be taken simply as a renewed emphasis on our Lord's general popularity with the multitudes as a teacher, and perhaps connects rather with what follows than with what immediately precedes.

38–40. *A warning against the scribes*

(Cf. Mt xxiii 1, 6, 7; Lk. xi 43, xx 46, 47)

38 And in his teaching he said, Beware of the scribes, which
desire to walk in long robes, and *to have* salutations in the
39 marketplaces, and chief seats in the synagogues, and chief
40 places at feasts: they which devour widows' houses, and [1]
for a pretence make long prayers; these shall receive
greater condemnation.

---

[1] Or, *even while for a pretence they make.*

These verses contain all that Mk judged it to his purpose to introduce of the long discourse against Pharisaism which apparently stood in 'Q', and which Mt and Lk (especially the former) reproduce at fuller length. Here certainly it would appear as though Mk were summarizing from memory. The *long robe* down to the feet was the dignified dress of an Oriental notable. A variant reading in the Syriac version presupposes a Greek word meaning 'colonnades' (cf. Jn x 23), but is not very likely to be right. It is not known in what precise way the scribes could be said to *devour widows' houses.* Some scholars think that our Lord's words are aimed at a special class of Jerusalem scribes. The condemnation would be too sweeping if it were regarded as referring to all scribes as such. Josephus, in one passage, speaks of the Pharisees as 'making men believe that they were highly favoured by God' and as 'inveigling women'.[1] C. F. Burney points out that the Aramaic term for 'phylacteries' properly means 'prayers', and suggests that *make long prayers* is a variant translation of the phrase which in Mt xxiii 5 appears as *make broad their phylacteries.*[2]

41–44. *The Widow's Mites*

(Cf. Lk xxi 1–4)

41 And he sat down over against the treasury, and beheld how the multitude cast money[1] into the treasury: and many
42 that were rich cast in much. And there came a[2] poor widow, and she cast in two mites, which make a farthing.
43 And he called unto him his disciples, and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, This poor widow cast in more than
44 all they which are casting into the treasury: for they all did cast in of their superfluity; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, *even* all her living.

[1] Gr. *brass.* [2] Gr. *one.*

In contrast with our Lord's warning against the ostentatious hypocrisy of the scribes who *devoured widows' houses* is His commendation of the widow, a poor woman of the *fellahin* class, who sacrificed her next meal by casting into the Temple treasury the two tiny coins which were all she possessed for the purchase of food. Rich men cast in *of their superfluity* large sums. Our Lord would teach that gifts are of value in the sight of God in proportion to what they cost the giver. Philosophers have said the same thing (cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* IV i 19), but, as Lagrange remarks, the sayings of philosophers have not had much practical effect in exciting generosity. 'The lesson drawn by our Saviour from the humble widow is still the motive and inspiration of the most admirable acts of devotion. His words are not merely true observations: they are a principle of life' (cf. 2 Cor viii and ix, esp. viii 2, 12).

---

[1] Josephus, *Antiquities* XVII ii 4.
[2] Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 10.

41. *The treasury.* The word so rendered is used elsewhere to mean 'rooms or cells in which the Temple valuables or deposits were stored' (cf. 1 Macc xiv 49; 2 Macc iii 6, iv 42, v 18; Josephus, *Antiquities* XIX vi 1). Here it may possibly refer to some kind of receptacle for the offerings of the faithful. According to the Mishnah there were thirteen such receptacles in the Temple, known (from their shape) as 'trumpets' (Schürer II i 261).[1] *Money*: literally *brass* (R.V. mg.), here not to be limited to copper coins, but used for money in general.

42. *A poor widow*: so rightly R.V. text. R.V. mg. is a needlessly literal rendering of a characteristic Marcan semitism. *Two mites*, i. e. two *lepta*. A *lepton* was the smallest existing denomination of copper coin, of which two went to a *quadrans* (here rendered 'farthing') which in turn was the fourth part of an *as*. The legal value of a lepton is said to have been about equivalent to one-third of an English farthing (see *H. D. B.*, s.v. 'Money'). The explanation that the two *lepta* together made up a *quadrans* is for the benefit of Mk's Roman readers, who could not be expected to be familiar with the coinage of Palestine. Some commentators make the point that since the widow's last *quadrans* was in two coins, she might have kept one of them. The theory that there was a Rabbinical rule against offering less than two *lepta* to the Treasury is regarded by Strack and Billerbeck as a false deduction from a passage in the Talmud which really means something quite different.

A General Note on Chapter XIII

The purpose of this chapter is to exhibit our Lord as having foreseen in detail and declared privately in advance to His disciples, in a conversation which He had with them before His Passion, the course of future events, including the grievous troubles and calamities which were to fall both upon the Church and upon the world. The expectation of the coming End of the Age, and the belief that it was close at hand, we know to have played a dominating part in the thought and outlook of the earliest believers. Jesus was the Messiah, declared to be the Son of God with power by the Resurrection (Rom i 4), exalted in virtue of the Ascension to the position of Lord and Christ (Acts ii 36), but destined to come again (Acts i 11) in the glory of His Father with the holy angels (Mk viii 38); and Christian converts in the Gentile world were those who had 'turned from idols

---

[1] Strack and Billerbeck, however, are of opinion that *the treasury* here means the chamber in which the thirteen 'trumpets' were set, and that those who made offerings had to declare the sum which they were offering, and the special purpose for which it was intended, to the priest on duty, who supervised the proceedings. What happened was probably both visible and audible through the open door of the 'treasury' (Strack and Billerbeck, *op. cit.* ii, pp. 37 sqq.).

. . . to serve a living and true God, *and to wait for His Son from heaven*' (1 Thess i 9–10). How long would be the period that must intervene before the glorious fulfilment of their hopes? Already in 2 Thess S. Paul has occasion to warn believers against a too confident presumption that the time is at hand. There are certain mysterious events which must first come to pass, including the removal of a restraining force that operates at present, and the eventual revelation of Antichrist as the immediate precursor of the End (2 Thess ii 1–10). Nevertheless the cry of the waiting Church, 'O Lord, how long?' was especially urgent in periods of persecution and of public calamity, when 'men's hearts were failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which were coming on the earth' (Lk xxi 26). And Mk was writing in such a period. There had been *wars and rumours of wars, famines* and *earthquakes in divers places.* Bishop Gore aptly compares the opening passage of Tacitus's *Histories,* in which the Roman historian, after referring to the horrors and calamities, the portents and disasters of the time, proceeds to remark that 'never has it been proved by such terrible disasters to Rome or such clear evidence that the gods were concerned not with our safety but with vengeance on our sins'.[1] Persecution, moreover, had befallen the Christian Church. The case of S. Paul, who had been accused before *sanhedrins and synagogues* (cf. 2 Cor xi 23 sqq.) and had stood before *rulers* (Felix and Festus) and *kings* (Agrippa and Nero), was typical of many others. At Rome in Nero's persecution, following upon the great fire of A. D. 64 in which a large portion of the city was burnt down, *brother* did indeed *deliver up brother to death,* for those first arrested had given information about others. Large numbers were put to death, and the Christians, being accused, in the phrase of Tacitus, of 'hatred of the human race', were made to know the bitterness of being *hated of all men* for the sake of the Name (Tacitus, *Annals* xv 44). It is thought that the two Apostles, S. Peter and S. Paul, were martyred about this time at Rome. It is intelligible that in such terrible circumstances the Church clung to and cherished the tradition of the Saviour's apocalyptic words.

For the long discourse extending from xiii 3–37 is arranged in such a fashion as to be in form an *apocalypse,* i. e. an unveiling or revelation of the future; and, like the Pauline Apocalypse of 2 Thess ii, it is designed to discourage the assumption that what has occurred is anything more than the *beginning* of certain future events which are still to come to pass. The Christians of Rome are assured that the Lord had foreseen from the beginning the bitter experiences of suffering and persecution which had befallen them. They are encouraged to hope still that the glorious *dénouement*—the coming of the Son of Man—may indeed happen before their own generation has passed away (verse 30); nevertheless, it is necessary that *the gospel must first be preached unto all the nations* (verse 10), and the precise day and hour of supreme fulfilment was the Father's secret, which not even the Son Himself, in His life upon earth, had been suffered to know (verse 32). Nevertheless, though heaven and earth passed away, the words of the Saviour should stand secure (verse 31). The keynotes of the whole are contained in such sayings as *Be not troubled: these things must needs come to pass; but the end is not yet* (verse 7); *He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved* (verse 13); *But take ye heed; behold, I have told you all things beforehand* (verse 23); *Take ye heed, watch; for ye know not when the time is* (verse 33); *Watch therefore . . . And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch* (verses 35, 37).

---

[1] Gore, *Belief in Christ*, pp. 160–161; Tacitus, *Histories* i 2–3. The narrative of the *Histories*, however, which begins with the year 69 A. D., refers to the events of a few years later than the probable date of S. Mark's Gospel.

The contents of the Apocalyptic Discourse are represented as being guaranteed to the Church by the authority of those four leading disciples of Jesus whose 'call' Mk had described in i 16–20. It is explained that they had desired further light on a saying of Jesus forecasting the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem. The connexion is nevertheless somewhat awkwardly made, for the discourse itself contains no explicit reference to the Temple, though it is probable that a mysterious future profanation of the Holy Place may be part of the meaning of the veiled allusion in verse 14. The scope of the discourse is in any case much wider than the question ascribed to the four disciples in verse 4 would suggest if interpreted strictly by reference to verse 2, and it is probable that the repeated phrase *these things* in verse 4 should in fact be interpreted rather in the light of what follows than of what has preceded—i. e. that the verse is correctly glossed by Mt, who has *What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the consummation of the age?* (Mt xxiv 3). It is at least tempting to think that what is really a message for the contemporary Church is here introduced into the Gospel narrative in the form of an instruction supposed to have been given privately by the Lord to a group of leading disciples: and such a device would certainly be in keeping with what is known in general of the methods of Apocalyptic writing, as also with what we were led to suppose in the case of certain other 'esoteric' passages in this Gospel (cf. iv 10 sqq., viii 17–19, and notes *ad loc.*).

Though this, however, may hold good as regards the arrangement, setting, and adaptation of the discourse in its present form, it does not follow that its contents may not represent *substantially* our Lord's own general outlook upon the future, or that it does not contain a good number of sayings which are authentically His. That He anticipated suffering and persecution as likely to befall His disciples is historically probable (see the General Note on viii 27–x 45 *supra*, pp. 110–111), and some of the matter contained in xiii 9–13 has parallels elsewhere in the Gospels (Mt x 17–22, Lk xii 11, 12) and probably stood in 'Q'. It is probable, too, that our Lord thought of Himself as the future 'Son of Man' (cf. xiv 62), and that, looking upon the future in terms of prophetic symbolism, His mind passed beyond the immediate to the ultimate future, in such a fashion that the coming doom of Jerusalem was thrown (as Bishop Gore expresses it) 'upon the background of the final and universal judgement'.[1] On the other hand, it is probable also that (in the same writer's phrase) He had no detailed 'map of the future' spread before Him. Prophetic vision needs to be sharply distinguished from prediction or detailed soothsaying. Not improbably to our Lord's own human consciousness the vision even of the ultimate future (though He is represented as explicitly disclaiming precise knowledge of the day or the hour) presented itself as the vision of something which was, or which might be, at hand. Beyond His own sufferings, beyond the already now imminent doom of the city which had so signally failed to know 'the time of its visitation' (Lk xix 44), He descried with the prophetic intuition of faith the mysterious coming of the Son of Man *in clouds with great power and glory*; descried it, it may be, as already within the horizon of the existing generation, so that some of those still alive might yet witness the great Day (Mk ix 1, xiii 30). This was certainly the prevalent view in the earliest Christian Church (cf. 1 Thess iv 13 sqq., 1 Cor xv 51 sqq.), and it is in accordance with what appears to have been a constant characteristic of the psychology of prophecy in general. There is a real element of truth in the old-fashioned phrase about the prophetic 'fore-shortening of the future'. The Kingdom of God is at hand—and the prophet's faith projects it upon the canvas of his vision in such a way that it appears to be already imminent and dominates his outlook. Certitude assumes the psychological form of a sense of immediacy. The goal of God's realized purposes is thought of, not as of something that is dim and remote and shadowy, but as of something that is vivid and close at hand.

Thus it is likely enough that the substance of much of Mk xiii may in one way or another go back to the historical mind of our Lord. It is not certain, however, that the whole of it does so, and it is probable that the chapter, as it now stands in the Gospel, is composite. It has been argued above that the psychology of our Lord's human outlook upon the future was akin to that of the Old Testament prophets, and that His conception of the coming Consummation was expressed in the terms of an imagery which was derived in the main from the language of the contemporary 'apocalyptic' tradition. So much at least of solid truth would appear to be contained, along with much that is exaggerated or distorted in emphasis, in the contentions of Schweitzer, J. Weiss, and the so-called 'eschatological' school of New Testament critics.[2] Nevertheless, it is probable that our Lord partly transmuted the Jewish apocalyptic hope, even while He accepted it.[1] As B. H. Streeter has expressed it, the eschatology of Jesus was 'a simpler, wider, and greater thing than ordinary Jewish Apocalyptic'.[2] He professed no knowledge of the day or the hour (verse 32); He dwells in this very chapter on the unexpectedness of the End (verses 35–37); He discourages elsewhere the demand for a 'sign' (Mk viii 11, 12); and yet Chapter XIII, as it now stands in the Gospel, is very largely concerned with the mapping out, in considerable detail, of the premonitory 'signs' and distinguishable stages of the last great eschatological drama. Apart from the corresponding Matthaean and Lucan parallels, there is nothing elsewhere in the recorded sayings of our Lord which quite approaches in definiteness and detail of prediction the picture here drawn of the successive stages of the End. It is not surprising that the hypothesis first suggested by Colani in 1864, viz. that a short independent Apocalypse of Jewish or Jewish-Christian origin has been combined in this chapter with genuine sayings of our Lord, has found wide acceptance among critics even of a generally conservative type. The passages which it is reasonable to assign to such an incorporated document are three, viz. verses 7–8, 14–20, 24–27. Taken together they constitute an apocalyptic picture of the *dénouement* of world-history in three acts, viz. (1) Signs of the end, i. e. the Messianic Woes which form the 'birth-pangs' of the New Age (verses 7–8); (2) Manifestation of the Antichrist (the writer thought of the mysterious 'abomination of Desolation' as a *Personage*, see below), the Great Tribulation, Flight of Believers—all these were recognized elements in the Antichrist tradition (verses 14–20); (3) Manifestation of the Son of Man, preceded by cosmic catastrophes and followed by the Gathering of the Elect (verses 24–27). Assuming that these three passages really did at one time form parts of a separate document, which has come to be wholly or partly incorporated in the Gospels, it is more probable that the document in question was of Jewish-Christian than of purely Jewish origin (as Colani supposed). The author was in all probability a Christian prophet who (like the author of the Book of Revelation) believed himself to be charged by the Spirit to convey to the Christian Church an apocalyptic message in the name of the risen Jesus. The substance of his writing consisted (as is usual in such cases) rather in the reaffirmation of accepted apocalyptic beliefs than in the statement of anything which was radically new. But because what he wrote gave expression to beliefs and expectations then generally current amongst Christians, and was believed to be a message from Christ, his words have become incorporated along with authentic sayings of Jesus to form the apocalyptic discourse of S. Mk xiii as we now have it.

---

[1] Gore, *Belief in Christ*, pp. 154, 155.

[2] A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, pp. 328 sqq.

For further discussion see Charles, *Eschatology Hebrew, Jewish and*

---

[1] E. von Dobschütz, *The Eschatology of the Gospels*, pp. 150 sqq.

[2] B. H. Streeter, *Foundations*, p. 119.

Christian (ed. 2), pp. 379 sqq.; B. H. Streeter in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 179 sqq.; V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii, pp. 115 sqq.; J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium*, pp. 273 sqq.; Loisy, *Les Evangiles Synoptiques* ii, pp. 393 sqq.

CHAPTER XIII

1–2. *The Prophecy of the Destruction of the Temple*

(Cf. Mt xxiv 1–2; Lk xxi 5–6)

1 And as he went forth out of the temple, one of his disciples
saith unto him, Master,[1] behold, what manner of stones and
2 what manner of buildings! And Jesus said unto him,
Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left
here one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown
down.

---

[1] Or, *Teacher*.

Herod's Temple, begun in 20–19 B.C. and still unfinished in the time of our Lord (cf. Jn ii 20), was justly accounted one of the wonders of the world. 'The building is spoken of as exceedingly impressive in its grandeur. Its eastern front was covered with plates of gold, which threw back the rays of the rising sun, and formed an object of rare beauty for miles around. The stone of which it was built was white marble, and a large part of the side walls was covered with gold' (*H. D. B.* s.v. 'Temple'). For further description see Josephus, *Antiquities* xv 11. For a conjectural restoration see Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, Frontispiece (also ground-plan facing p. 116). The admiration of our Lord's disciples—provincial Jews, who visited Jerusalem only at the seasons of pilgrimage—is intelligible enough. Nevertheless, it is the conviction of Jesus that the Temple is doomed, and like Micah and Jeremiah of old (Micah iii 12, Jer xxvi 6, 18) He prophesies its destruction. The Temple was actually destroyed by fire in the course of the seige of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, contrary to the orders of Titus, who had wished to preserve it (Josephus, *De Bell. Jud.* vi 4): subsequently, however, orders were given for the whole city and Temple to be demolished (Josephus, *op. cit.* vii 1, 1). 'To Jewish ears the prediction that the Temple should be destroyed still sounded blasphemous, as in the days of Micah and Jeremiah: for the Temple still signified the immediate Presence of the Deity. Before the Romans could destroy it, the Divine Presence departed with the cry "Let us remove hence", as Josephus (*op. cit.* vi 5, 3), with an echo of Ezekiel, narrates. Even in Rev xi 2 the Temple proper is regarded as inviolable: it is only the outer court that is given over to the heathen' (Wellhausen). The charge of speaking against the Temple was brought up against Jesus at His trial (Mk xiv 57 sqq.), and Wellhausen thinks it was the real charge on which our Lord was condemned (see notes *ad loc.*). Cf. also Acts vi 13–14, Jn ii 19. D and Old Lat. add to the text here the words *and after three days another* [Temple] *shall rise without hands.* No doubt W. C. Allen is right in thinking that this is merely a gloss in anticipation of xiv 58, but it is probable that our Lord did actually on some occasion say something of the kind. The new supernatural Temple replacing the old may be regarded as symbolizing the new redeemed Israel, with whom the Divine Presence perpetually dwells (cf. 1 Cor iii 16–17, Rev xxi 22).

3–8. *The Beginnings of the Apocalyptic Drama*

(Cf. Mt xxiv 3–8; Lk xxi 7–11)

3 And as he sat on the mount of Olives over against the
temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him
4 privately, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what
shall be the sign when these things are all about to be
5 accomplished? And Jesus began to say unto them, Take
6 heed that no man lead you astray. Many shall come in my
7 name, saying, I am *he*; and shall lead many astray. And
when ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars, be not
troubled: *these things* must needs come to pass; but the end
8 is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: there shall be earthquakes in divers
places; there shall be famines: these things are the beginning of travail.

The names of the four disciples disappear in Mt and Lk. Except for i 16–20 the two pairs of brothers do not elsewhere appear as a distinct group, and Andrew is here separated from his brother Peter, who stands first, presumably because of the association elsewhere of the trio *Peter and James and John* (cf. v 37, ix 2, xiv 33), and perhaps also as spokesman. *These things* in verse 4 should strictly refer to the destruction of the Temple (verses 1, 2): actually the words appear to refer rather to the discourse which follows, the connexion of which with the prophecy about the destruction of the Temple seems artificial (see the General Note, *supra*, p. 179).

The practical object of the Apocalyptic Discourse is seen in the note of warning with which it begins. *Many shall come in my name*—does this mean simply that pseudo-Messiahs shall arise, or that persons shall arise who will actually claim to be Jesus Himself? The first person after the time of our Lord who is definitely known to have claimed to be the Messiah is Barcochba, the leader of the insurrection of A. D. 132, but Sanday is probably justified in remarking that 'from the time of the Maccabees to the time of Barcochba there was a Messianic background—or something like it—to every popular movement that swept over Palestine',[1] and it is natural to think of well-known pretenders like Theudas and Judas of Galilee, or even of the 'Egyptian' of Acts xxi 38.

6–8. These verses form the 'first act' of the supposed incorporated Apocalypse (*vide* General Note *supra*). *For wars and rumours of wars, famines and earthquakes* as destined to be among the 'signs of the end', cf. 2 Esdras ix 3, xiii 31, xv 14–15. The idea was an apocalyptic commonplace; cf. Rev vi 1–8, Oracl Sib iii 633–647, Eth En xcix 4, 2 Bar xxvii 5, xlviii 32, lxx 3, 8. From the historical point of view it is natural to think of the famine under Claudius (Acts xi 28), of the earthquakes at Laodicea in 61 and at Pompeii in A. D. 62, and of the campaigns of Corbulo in Armenia, various minor risings in Palestine, the continual menace of Parthian invasion on the eastern frontier and the generally disturbed state of the Empire in Nero's time. For *be not troubled*, cf. 2 Thess ii 2. These things, it is insisted, are only the *beginning* of the 'travail-pangs' of the New Age: *the end is not yet.* The doctrine of the 'woes' or 'travail-pangs' of the Messianic Age (based upon such passages as Is xxvi 17, lxvi 8; Jer xxii 23; Hos xiii 13; Micah iv 9 sqq.) was in later times a rabbinical commonplace, and it is thought by Strack and Billerbeck that the expression was already technical in this sense in the time of our Lord.[2]

9–13. *The Sufferings of the Faithful have been foreseen*

(Cf. Mt xxiv 9–14, x 17–22; Lk xxi 12–19, xii 11–12)

9 But take ye heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you
up to councils; and in synagogues shall ye be beaten; and
before governors and kings shall ye stand for my sake, for
10 a testimony unto them. And the gospel must first be
11 preached unto all the nations. And when they lead you *to
judgement*, and deliver you up, be not anxious beforehand
what ye shall speak: but whatsoever shall be given you in
that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but

---

[1] Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 81.

[2] Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N. T. aus Talmud u. Midrasch* i, p. 950.

12 the Holy Ghost. And brother shall deliver up brother to
death, and the father his child; and children shall rise up
13 against parents, and cause them to be put to death.[1] And
ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he
that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved.

[1] Or, *put them to death.*

Mt has the greater part of these warnings in the context of the discourse on the mission of the Twelve (Mt x 17–22; cf. also Lk xii 11–12): it is probable therefore that the passage stood in 'Q'. *Councils* (trans. rather 'sanhedrins') and *synagogues* should probably be taken together: R.V. punctuates wrongly, and the sentence should be translated either 'they shall deliver you up to sanhedrins and synagogues: ye shall be beaten, and shall stand, &c.' or else 'they shall hand you over, and ye shall be beaten in[1] sanhedrins and synagogues, &c.'. Every organized Jewish synagogue had its *beth-din* or local court: on local sanhedrins, distinct from the Great Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, see Schürer II i 150–151, 169. For the experience of S. Paul cf. 2 Cor xi 24. The term *governors* refers probably to Roman magistrates, procurators like Felix and Festus, proconsuls like Gallio in Achaia. *Kings* would apply to the Emperor, as well as to such minor potentates as Herod Agrippa. The phrase *for a testimony unto them* (used also in i 44) must be understood in each case where it occurs in accordance with the context. Here the idea appears to be that witness or *testimony* is borne to the Gospel by prisoners on their trial, so that *governors and kings* are obliged to listen to the message (cf. Acts xxiv 24 sqq., xxvi 1 sqq.). Lk xxi 13 has *it shall turn to you for a testimony*, which perhaps means 'it will give you an opportunity to bear witness'.

10. For the thought of the universal preaching of the Gospel cf. xiv 9. The words, taken in their natural sense, appear to reflect the thought of S. Paul: the gathering in of *the fulness of the Gentiles* is a necessary part of the Divine purpose and must take place before the End can come (cf. Rom xi 25 sqq.). The verse is omitted by Lk; J. Weiss thinks it may have been added by a scribe, or even by Mk himself, as a marginal note which has been wrongly incorporated in the text. It was certainly found in its present position, however, in the copy of Mk used by Mt, since Mt xxiv 14 both reproduces the substance of Mk xiii 10 and also shows the influence of Mk xiii 9. The verse appears to represent the conviction of those who worked as missionaries of Christianity to the Gentiles: the earliest *Jewish*-Christian Church appears rather to have thought of the repentance of *Israel* as

---

[1] The preposition used could have this meaning in the vulgar Gk. of the period.

the necessary pre-condition of the End (Acts iii 19–20; cf. Mt x 23). Lagrange attempts to interpret strictly by reference to the present context and thinks that the meaning is simply that 'it is before all things necessary that the Gospel should be preached to all nations', and that witness borne before heathen tribunals is one way of doing this.

11. This verse appears clearly to have stood in 'Q' (Mt x 19–20, Lk xii 11–12), and perhaps contains the germ of the 'Paraclete' doctrine of Jn xvi 7 sqq. For witness such as is here described, borne with inspired eloquence in the power of the Spirit, cf. the case of Stephen (Acts vi 10, vii 55). On the general subject of speech inspired by the Spirit, see H. Weinel, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister*, pp. 71 sqq.

12. For family divisions as a consequence of the Gospel cf. Lk xii 51 sqq. Anticipations of such unnatural strife are common in apocalyptic descriptions of the last days, perhaps ultimately by way of inference from Micah vii 6: cf. 2 Esdras v 9, vi 24, Jubilees xxiii 19, 2 Baruch lxx 3.

13 a. For the hatred of Christians cf. Tac. *Annals* xv 44; for hatred on account of the Name cf. 1 Pet iv 14; Epistle of Polycarp viii 2; Justin, *Apol.* I iv 3; Tertull. *Apol.* ii.

13 b. The meaning may be that *he that endureth* in faith and loyalty until the final 'End' shall obtain salvation without having to pass through death—so J. Weiss, who points out that the two things (anticipation of coming martyrdoms and promise of preservation) stand elsewhere side by side, e. g. in the Apocalypse of S. John: cf. also 2 Esdras vi 25, vii 27. Or the meaning may be more simply, as in Rev ii 10, that endurance unto death shall receive the reward of eternal life. With the general thought cf. 2 Tim ii 11–13.

14–20. *The Antichrist and the great Tribulation*

(Cf. Mt xxiv 15–22; Lk xxi 20–24, xvii 31)

14 But when ye see the abomination of desolation standing
where he ought not (let him that readeth understand),
then let them that are in Judaea flee unto the mountains:
15 and let him that is on the housetop not go down, nor enter
16 in, to take anything out of his house: and let him that is
17 in the field not return back to take his cloke. But woe
unto them that are with child and to them that give suck
18 in those days! And pray ye that it be not in the winter.
19 For those days shall be tribulation, such as there hath not
been the like from the beginning of the creation which God
20 created until now, and never shall be. And except the

Lord had shortened the days, no flesh would have been saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he chose, he shortened the days.

Verse 14: cf. Dan xii 11. Verse 19: cf. Dan xii 1.

In this section is comprised Act II of the incorporated Apocalypse. It is wholly on the lines of Jewish apocalyptic tradition, in that form of it which included the expectation that the secular conflict between Good and Evil which had pervaded all history should in the end of the days assume a decisive form, and that shortly before the final victory of God and of His Christ the power of incarnate Evil should be manifested in the mysterious form either of a God-opposing tyrant (such as had been Antiochus Epiphanes in the second century B.C., such as the Roman Emperors had come to be for the seer of the Revelation of S. John), or else of a seductive agency, the incarnation of Beliar (= 'Lawlessness') who should claim for himself the prerogatives of God (so the Pauline Apocalypse in 2 Thess ii 3 sqq., where the Antichrist is described as *the man of sin . . . that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God*). It is probable that the roots of the conception are to be found ultimately in the (originally Babylonian) legend of the battle of God with a dragon-like monster, of which traces are to be found in various parts of the O.T. (cf. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 29–114). The idea of Antichrist itself can be traced back certainly to the Book of Daniel, in which the persecuting King Antiochus Epiphanes is depicted in the character of the Great Opponent of God and of His saints under the figure of the 'little horn' of Dan vii 8 sqq. But the meaning of the prophecy was not regarded as having been exhausted by its contemporary fulfilment, and the mysterious phrase about the *abomination of desolation* (which originally referred to the altar of Zeus Ouranios set up by Antiochus on the desecrated site of the Altar of Burnt-Offering in the Temple: cf. 1 Macc i 54) was regarded as a prophetic word still destined to find fulfilment in the future. The phrase is paraphrased by Lk and interpreted as referring generally to the siege and desolation of Jerusalem (Lk xxi 20): but it is probable that Lk is writing later than A.D. 70 and interprets the prophecy in the light of events. Since Mk in v 14 takes up the neuter phrase *abomination of desolation* by a *masculine* participle (rightly translated by R.V. *standing where 'he' ought not*), it is probable that he thought of the 'abomination' as a mysterious Personage, i.e. as the Antichrist, and that Mt. xxiv 15 rightly interprets *where he ought not* as meaning *in the holy place*, i.e. in the Temple (cf. 2 Thess ii 4). The Manifestation of the Antichrist in the Temple, the Flight of the Believers, the Great Tribulation, and the Shortening of the Days for the sake of the Elect were recognized elements in the Antichrist tradition: cf. *E.R.E.* s.v. 'Antichrist'; W. Bousset, *The Antichrist Legend, passim*; M. Friedländer, *Der Antichrist*, pp. 118 sqq. Visitors to Italy may be reminded of the great fresco portraying *The Deeds of Antichrist* by Signorelli on the walls of one of the chapels of the Cathedral at Orvieto.

14. *The abomination of desolation*: the phrase is quoted from the LXX of Dan. ix 27, except that the LXX there has 'desolations' in the plural.[1] The Hebrew means 'the profanation that appals', and the emphasis is not upon the idea of a 'desolation' of the Temple, in the sense of its being destroyed, but upon the idea of its being horribly profaned. The words *let him that readeth understand* are often taken as evidence that Mk's ultimate source is here a written document and not a spoken discourse. It is probable enough that the short apocalypse assumed to underlie this section *was* a written document, but the words in question do not prove it. They are probably, as McNeile on Mt xxiv 15 suggests, an added remark either by Mk himself or by the original apocalyptist, and mean 'Let the reader note the new and terrible meaning here given to the words in Daniel'. *Let them that are in Judaea flee.* It is implied, as J. Weiss points out, that the prophecy was designed originally not for the readers of Mk but for people in Judaea: the small apocalypse is therefore of Palestinian origin and presumably came to Mk from the tradition of Palestinian Christianity. Believers are to flee *to the mountains* as in Maccabaean days (1 Macc ii 28). Eusebius informs us that as the Roman armies approached Jerusalem the members of the Christian Church in the city, 'in obedience to an oracle vouchsafed to the leaders there by revelation', escaped and withdrew to Pella in Peraea,[2] but the idea of a direct reference to the actual source used by Mk here is improbable.

15–16. The idea of extreme haste is vividly emphasized. The roof of the Oriental house was flat, and communicated with the street by means of an external staircase. The outer garment or *cloke* was laid aside for work in the fields: cf. Vergil, *Georgics* i 299: *nudus ara, sere nudus.*

17. Hasty flight would of course be more difficult for nursing mothers, but it is possible that there may be an allusion to the apocalyptic expectation of untimely or monstrous births as destined to take place in the last days: cf. 2 Esdras v 8, vi 21.

18. Mk's *it* is more mysterious than the paraphrase *your flight* in Mt xxiv 20. The torrential rains of the Judaean *winter* would add to the difficulties of fleeing to the mountains.

19. The Great Tribulation was predicted in Dan xii 1. Cf. Jer xxx 7, Ass Mos viii 1, Rev vii 14.

20. For the idea of the Shortening of the Days cf. 2 Baruch xx 1–2; lxxxiii 1; 2 Esdras iv 26; 1 Cor. vii 29; Epistle of Barnabas

---

[1] The singular form occurs in the LXX of Dan xii 11.

[2] Euseb. *H.E.* iii v 3.

iv 3. The idea is that the Great Tribulation must endure for a fixed period (in Dan xii 7 *a time, times, and an half*, i. e. 3½ years): inasmuch however as, if this were strictly carried out *au pied de la lettre*, *no flesh* (i. e. nobody) would escape, the period, by a special intervention of the Divine mercy, would be shortened for the sake of the Elect. The *elect* whom God *chose* are the prophetic 'remnant', who are to inherit the Messianic blessings. Cf. Eth En i 1 and many other passages in Enoch.

21–23. *A renewed Warning against Deceivers*

(Cf. Mt xxiv 23–25)

21 And then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is the
22 Christ; or, Lo, there; believe *it*[1] not: for there shall arise
false Christs and false prophets, and shall shew signs and
wonders, that they may lead astray, if possible, the elect.
23 But take ye heed: behold, I have told you all things beforehand.

---

[1] Or, *him*.

The warning here virtually repeats that of verses 5–6; it is possible that the passage is redactional. D and two Old Latin MSS. omit the reference to *false Christs*. For *signs and wonders* exhibited by false prophets cf. Dt xiii 1 sqq., Ex vii 11, 12; also the *great signs* of Rev xiii 13 sqq. wrought by the second 'beast' (who stands for the 'False Prophet'—cf. Rev xix 20). For the expectation that *signs and lying wonders* would be worked by the Antichrist through the power of Satan cf. 2 Thess ii 9.

23. The word *ye* in this verse is very emphatic in the Greek. The Evangelist has been copying a source which spoke in general terms of *the elect*: he here addresses himself directly to his readers, i. e. to the Christian community, *sc.* 'But do *you* take heed! The warning of Jesus is meant for *you*! He has forewarned you of everything, so that there is no excuse for being misled!'

24–27. *The Coming of the Son of Man*

(Cf. Mt xxiv 29–31; Lk xxi 25–28)

24 But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be
darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the
25 stars shall be falling from heaven, and the powers that are
26 in the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall they see

the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and
27 glory. And then shall he send forth the angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven.

Verse 26: cf. Dan vii 13, 14.

This section constitutes Act III of the apocalyptic drama. If the document here followed by Mk were originally of *Jewish* origin, by *the Son of man* would be meant in the first instance simply the apocalyptic figure of Jewish expectation (cf. Eth En xlvi 1 sqq., xlviii 2 sqq., lxii 9 sqq., lxiii 11, lxix 26 sqq., lxx 1; 2 Esdras xiii 1–58; Dan. vii 13, 14): the identification with Jesus would be made by the Christian community. It is more likely, however, that the source was Christian and referred from the first to the expected coming of *Jesus* as the Son of Man from heaven. There is every reason to believe that our Lord Himself had spoken of His coming in terms of this symbolism: cf. xiv 62, and see further Introduction, pp. liii sq.

24. *After that tribulation* refers back to the Great Tribulation of verses 19–20. The description of celestial portents as heralding the End was conventional in apocalyptic writings (cf. 2 Esdras v 4, Eth En lxxx 4–7, Ass Mos x 5, Oracl Sib iii 796–806, 2 Baruch xxxii 1), and was based on the (perhaps consciously symbolical) language used by the prophets to describe any anticipated judgement or intervention of God (cf. Amos viii 9, Joel ii 10, iii 15, Ezek. xxxii 7–8, Is xiii 10, xxxiv 4).

26. Mk's impersonal plural *they shall see* (i. e. 'people shall see') is equivalent to a passive, *sc.* 'Then shall be seen, &c.' The Coming of the Son of Man signifies the consummation of the End, as the Manifestation of the Antichrist (verse 14) signified its beginning. The two 'signs' balance one another. Mt xxiv 30, with an implicit reference back to Mt xxiv 3, appears to duplicate the *datum* of Mk xiii 26 by distinguishing the '*sign*' *of the Son of Man* from the *Son of Man* Himself.

27. For the *angels* as Messianic agents cf. Mt xiii 41, Eth En lxi. For *the four winds* cf. Zech ii 6. Lk omits this verse (as too Jewish in conception?). The Gathering together of the Elect was a traditional idea, which in Judaism referred to the gathering of the Jews of the Dispersion to join the faithful Remnant in Judaea—a common thought in the writings of post-exilic prophets: cf. Is. xi 11, 16, xxvii 12, xxxv 8 sqq.; Ezek xxxix 27 sqq.; Zech x 6–11; Eth En lvii–lviii. Here, of course, the *elect* are Christians, the elect of the Son of Man (D and Old Lat. read, however, '*the* elect' instead of '*his* elect'): cf. 2 Thess ii 1.

The strange expression *from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven* occurs in some texts of Eth En lvii 2, and looks like a combination of Dt xxx 4 with Dt xiii 7. The meaning is perhaps 'from the farthest East, the extremity of the earth to which the Jew looked, turning his back on the sea: and from the farthest West, the end of heaven, where the sky dipped down into the ocean' (so Menzies, following Holtzmann).

28–29. *The Parable of the Fig-tree*

(Cf. Mt xxiv 32–33; Lk xxi 29–31)

28 Now from the fig tree learn her parable: when her branch
is now become tender, and putteth forth its leaves, ye know
29 that the summer is nigh; even so ye also, when ye see
these things coming to pass, know ye that he[1] is nigh,
even at the doors.

---

[1] Or, *it*.

The point of this comparison (at least in its present context) must be that the 'signs of the End' are an indication that the End itself is at hand, as certainly as the leafing of the fig-tree is an indication of the approach of summer (cf. Song of Songs ii 12–13). B. W. Bacon is perhaps right in stressing the idea of summer as the season of gladness, i. e. 'as surely as the glad season of summer follows winter's discontent, so surely will the Coming gladden the hearts of those who have endured to the end'. On the other hand the 'summer' here must not be allegorized into the 'harvest' of Mt xiii 30, 39. Wellhausen asks, Why the fig-tree in particular? Why not all the trees? To which Lagrange replies, Because apart from evergreens the fig-tree is the commonest of Palestinian trees. Lk, who is thinking of other countries than Palestine, does actually add 'and all the trees' (Lk xxi 29). The suggestion of Schwartz with regard to this passage has been noticed already (see notes on xi 12–14).

29. *These things* must be taken to refer not to the coming of the Son of Man but to its premonitory signs. If the words are to be interpreted strictly as a saying of Jesus we must translate with R.V. marg. *it is nigh*, not *he is nigh*. For *at the doors* cf. James v 9, Apoc iii 20.

30–32. *The Mystery of the Time of the End*

(Cf. Mt xxiv 34–36; Lk xxi 32–33)

30 Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away,
31 until all these things be accomplished. Heaven and earth
32 shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away. But
of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the
angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

Bousset suggests that 'the saying of Mk xiii 31, which springs from a mind in a high state of tension, stands as the conclusion of the (Jewish ?) apocalypse which Mk is adapting. It is probable that it originally formed the closing words of the prophecy of some unknown apocalyptist who spoke or wrote in ecstasy. The Christian Church naturally and without hesitation ascribed this strong saying to the exalted Lord. Later, under the impression that the Parousia was being delayed, verse 32 was added as an appendix.'[1] J. Weiss holds much the same view, and compares Rev xxii 18 sqq.

On the other hand, it is possible that all three verses may contain authentic sayings of our Lord: but, if so, it is not likely that they were all spoken on the same occasion. That our Lord thought of the *dénouement* as likely to take place within that generation is suggested also by Mk ix 1 and Mt x 23 (if the latter saying is genuine). The fact that He did so, assuming it to be indeed a fact, is best explained by the supposition (see General Note *supra*) that the psychology of His human mind was akin to that of the prophets. Verse 32 is regarded by Schmiedel as one of the 'pillar' passages for the life of Jesus:[2] a passage ascribing ignorance to the Son of God cannot, he thinks, have been invented in early Christian circles, and the saying is therefore authentic. Dalman, on the other hand, thinks that the absolute use of the expression *the Son* (here only in Mk; but cf. Mt xi 27, Lk x 22; and the usage is of course frequent in Jn) is unlikely to be found thus in a genuine saying of Jesus. 'In this case', he writes, 'the terms *the Son* and *the Father* are not due to comparison with each other, but appear as a ready-made formula, and are therefore to be attributed to the influence of the Church vocabulary on the text'. Dalman thinks that the original had simply 'not even the angels know it', and that the ending 'nor the Son, but the Father only' is an accretion.[3] It is noteworthy, from the point of view of Christology, that *the Son* is here placed higher than *the angels*, as in Heb i 4 sqq. For Mk's readers the way has been prepared for the absolute use of *the Son* by the antithesis between the 'son' and the successive 'servants' in the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mk xii 1–12).

30. *This generation*: not to be explained away (e. g. with Jerome on Mt xxiv 34) as signifying *aut omne genus hominum . . . aut specialiter Judaeorum.*

31. Cf. Is li 6, xxxiv 4, xl 8, liv 10; Ps cii 25–27. The words should, however, be taken rather as a strong asseveration that the prophecy in this chapter is reliable than as a prediction of the passing away of heaven and earth. Some think that the verse is an adaptation of our Lord's saying about the Law (Mt v 18) to His own teaching.

---

[1] Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, p. 43.

[2] *Encyc. Bibl.* ii, col. 1881.

[3] Dalman, *Sayings of Jesus* [E.T.], p. 194.

32. Cf. Acts i 7. Lk omits the saying in the present context, and Mt xxiv 36 (according to some MSS.) omits the words *neither the Son*. That the angels are not initiated into the secrets of God is a thought found also in Eph iii 10, 1 Pet i 12. For an elaborate discussion of the passage in the light of the history of its interpretation, see Lebreton, *Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité*, Note C, pp. 513 sqq.: also Gore, *Dissertations*, pp. 111 sqq.

33–37. *The Need of Watchfulness*

(Cf. Mt xxv 13–15 b, xxiv 42; Lk xii 38, 40, xix 12–13)

33 Take ye heed, watch and pray[1]: for ye know not when the
34 time is. *It is* as *when* a man, sojourning in another
country, having left his house, and given authority to his
servants,[2] to each one his work, commanded also the porter
35 to watch. Watch therefore: for ye know not when the lord
of the house cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at
36 cockcrowing, or in the morning; lest coming suddenly he
37 find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all,
Watch.

[1] Some ancient authorities omit *and pray*.

[2] Gr. *bondservants*.

The concluding adjuration to watchfulness is reinforced by the parable of the Absent Householder, which looks like a combination of Lk's parable of the Watching Servants (Lk xii 37 sqq.) with reminiscences of the parable of the Talents (Mt xxv 14–30) or Pounds (Lk xix 11–27). The various servants, to each of whom his work is assigned, do not here enter directly into the point of the parable, which turns upon the injunction given to the porter, who is to *watch*. The time between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m. is divided in the Roman fashion into four 'watches', though the 'watches' are given popular names. The last verse emphasizes the point that the lesson is intended not for the Apostles alone, but for all Christians without exception. Strictly speaking, the eschatological discourse in Mk's setting of it is addressed primarily to the four disciples of xiii 3.

CHAPTER XIV

1–2. *The Plot against our Lord's Life*

(Cf. Mt xxvi 1–5; Lk xxii 1–2)

1 Now after two days was *the feast of* the passover and the unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him with subtilty, and kill
2 him: for they said, Not during the feast, lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people.

The Paschal lambs were offered in the Temple in the late afternoon of the 14th day of the Jewish month Nisan, and the Paschal meal was eaten the same evening between sundown and midnight. The feast of Unleavened Bread began at sundown on the same day (reckoned, however, Jewish fashion, as the beginning of the day following, i. e. 15th Nisan), and lasted a week. For the coupling together of Passover and Unleavened Bread cf. 2 Chron xxxv 17. Since the Crucifixion occurred on a Friday (Mk xv 42), and the Last Supper the preceding evening (i. e. on Thursday), it is probable that the meal in Simon's house at Bethany (described in xiv 3–9) is to be regarded as having happened (according to Mk's setting of it) on the Wednesday evening, and the plot against our Lord's life on the Wednesday afternoon.

The phrase *after two days was the Passover* is ambiguous. If we are right in thinking that the time referred to is Wednesday afternoon, the most natural implication to the ordinary Western reader would be that the Passover was on Friday evening, i. e. that the Crucifixion coincided with the day on the evening of which the Paschal meal was eaten—which is the view implied by the Fourth Gospel (Jn xix 14). On the other hand, Mk xiv 12 appears to identify the Last Supper with the Paschal meal, in which case the Passover day would be Thursday, and not Friday.[1] It is possible that Mk is reckoning the days in the Jewish fashion, despite the fact that his readers will probably be Gentiles. The Passover was actually eaten after sundown on the 14th Nisan, when according to Jewish reckoning the 15th Nisan had already begun: and since the Jews counted their days inclusively, any time before sundown on the 13th Nisan could be described as being two days before the Passover (so Holtzmann, who compares *after three days* in Mk viii 31, ix 31, x 34 as equivalent to *the third day* in Mt xvi 21, Lk ix 22, &c.).

---

[1] For a discussion of the real or apparent discrepancy between the Synoptic and the Johannine traditions with regard to the date of the Crucifixion in relation to the Passover, see Additional Notes, pp. 262 sqq.

The phrase *the chief priests and the scribes* does not necessarily imply a formal meeting of the Sanhedrin, which included as a third division of its membership *the elders* of the people (Mk xiv 43, 53). It has been suggested that Mk means that in view of the approaching festival the decision of the informal council was to postpone action against Jesus until after the Passover, and that the unexpected offer of Judas (xiv 10–11) caused them subsequently to change their minds. But it is more probable that the emphasis is on the words *with subtilty*, i. e. in view of the near approach of the Passover, they must get hold of Him by some trick, since Jerusalem was crowded with pilgrims, many of whom sympathized with our Lord, and a public arrest might lead to a riot. C. H. Turner thinks that *for they said* is to be taken as an impersonal plural, i. e. 'for people were saying'. D has a variant reading which yields the meaning 'lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people during the feast'. The recently discovered MS. known as Θ provides yet a further variant, which may be translated 'For people were saying, "Not during the feast", and "there will be a tumult of the people"'.

Wellhausen thinks Mk only knew the intentions of the hierarchy by inference from their subsequent actions, and regards this passage as clear evidence that our Lord was arrested *before* the Passover had actually begun.

3–9. *The Anointing at Bethany*

(Cf. Mt xxvi 6–13; also Lk vii 36–50 (?); and Jn xii 1–8)

3 And while he was in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster cruse[1] of ointment of spikenard[2] very costly; *and*
4 she brake the cruse, and poured it over his head. But there were some that had indignation among themselves, *saying*, To what purpose hath this waste of the ointment
5 been made? For this ointment might have been sold for above three hundred pence,[3] and given to the poor. And
6 they murmured against her. But Jesus said, Let her alone; why trouble ye her? she hath wrought a good work
7 on me. For ye have the poor always with you, and whensoever ye will ye can do them good: but me ye have not

---

[1] Or, *a flask*.

[2] Gr. *pistic nard*, pistic being perhaps a local name. Others take it to mean *genuine*; others *liquid*.

[3] The word in the Greek denotes a coin worth about eightpence-halfpenny.

8 always. She hath done what she could: she hath anointed
9 my body aforehand for the burying. And verily I say
unto you, Wheresoever the gospel shall be preached
throughout the whole world, that also which this woman
hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.

The Lucan parallel (Lk vii 36–50) differs in many particulars from this story, and represents an independent tradition, or may indeed be a version of an (even originally) quite different incident: but the reason for Lk's omission of the episode here is in all probability the fact that he had already narrated a similar story elsewhere. Jn, who identifies the woman with Mary, the sister of Martha and Lazarus, and (having no mention of *Simon the leper*) leaves it to be inferred that the episode took place at their house, places the Anointing at Bethany on the eve of the Triumphal Entry, *six days before the Passover* (Jn xii 1, 12). Since the episode of the Anointing, in Mk's setting of it, separates the plot of the authorities against the life of our Lord from its sequel in the treachery of Judas (xiv 10–11), it is probable that we have here yet a further example of the Marcan intercalation of one episode into the context of another (see notes on iii 22–30), and that the Johannine position is to be preferred. Mk will have desired to associate the Anointing at Bethany as closely as possible with the Passion, because of the interpretation of it as an omen of coming death.

Bethany has already been mentioned in connexion with the Triumphal Entry (xi 1–11) and again at xi 11–12: Mk apparently thought of it as our Lord's regular place of lodging for the night during the period of His last pilgrimage to Jerusalem (see note on xi 11). Since Judas, however, appears to be familiar with Gethsemane as the night quarters of Jesus and His disciples (xiv 32, 43: cf. Jn xviii 1–2), it is thought by many that the Lucan account is to be preferred, according to which our Lord normally spent the night with His disciples in the open, on the slopes of the Mount of Olives (Lk xxi 37). On the present occasion, however, Jesus is *in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper*. Nothing more is said of Simon: it is assumed that he was a well-known personage: from which it may perhaps be inferred that the narrative originally took shape on Palestinian soil, and that Jewish Christianity knew who Simon was, and why he was called *the leper*, and whether he was cured of his disease. An unnamed woman, presumably wealthy, anoints Him with a rich ointment. Anointing was, as Menzies remarks, 'an ordinary refreshment after a journey or in connexion with a meal' (cf. Lk vii 46). What attracted attention was the extravagance of the gift. The ointment was 'genuine nard' and exceedingly costly. Indignation was expressed by some of the company at such culpable luxury. How much better to have sold the ointment and devoted the proceeds to the relief of the poor! But Jesus, though on other occasions He had taught lessons of poverty and charity (cf. x 21), nevertheless, because of the love that had prompted it, accepts the rich woman's costly gift. He knows that He will not be with the disciples much longer, and that His death is at hand. Full of foreboding, He sees in this anointing an anticipated preparation of His body for the tomb. That is to say, He reads into the woman's act of lavish generosity—it was one of the last kindnesses which was destined to be shown to Him on earth—a deeper significance than she herself could have intended, and declares, if the substance of verse 9 is authentic (the actual form of it is Christian, and presupposes the proclamation of *the Gospel* as being already in process *throughout the whole world*), that as long as He Himself is remembered, the woman's action shall never be forgotten.

The story has been variously interpreted by critics of different schools. It has been thought to be a development of the story in Lk vii 36 sqq., adapted to its present context by the introduction of the symbolic interpretation of the woman's action as a prophetic omen of the Saviour's death. But the two stories have really little in common except the name *Simon* as that of the host, and the name was an exceedingly common one at the period. If either story has influenced the other, it is more likely that the phrase *alabaster cruse of ointment* in Lk vii 37 is due to reminiscence of Mk xiv 3 on the part of Lk, than *vice versa.* Conversely, it is probable that the statement in Jn xii 3 that the ointment was poured on our Lord's feet, and not, as in Mk xiv 3, upon His head, is actually due to Johannine reminiscence of Lk vii 38. A further suggestion which has been made by those who regard the greater part of our Lord's reply as being due to an *ex post facto* development of the story is that the words *she hath anointed my body aforehand for the burying* are to be explained by reference to Mk xvi 1. The women on the first Easter morning were too late to anoint the Lord's body, since Jesus was already risen from the dead. The Church came to see in the Anointing at Bethany a kind of anticipatory rectification of the omission. B. W. Bacon is of opinion that the significance of the woman's action is to be found in the idea that she was really anointing Him as the Christ (a theory which was originally suggested by Pfleiderer), and that the reply of our Lord in verse 8 meant in effect: 'Not a throne, but martyrdom, awaits me.' He also suggests that it was the news of this anointing as the Christ which formed the substance of the information given by Judas to the High Priests, and which provided them with the grounds on which to bring against Jesus the accusation of pretending to be the Messiah:[1] but it is unlikely that Bacon is right in this supposition.

3. *An alabaster cruse*: the Greek is simply 'an *alabastron*', which may or may not imply that the material of which the phial containing the ointment was made was alabaster: the word seems to

---

[1] B. W. Bacon, 'What did Judas betray?' (*Hibbert Journal*, April 1921).

have been used generally in the sense of 'an unguent-flask'. *Ointment of spikenard*: see R.V. mg. Of the meanings there given, 'of genuine nard' is the most probable. Nard was an unguent made from a rare Indian plant, known also to the Greeks and Romans, and greatly valued in antiquity (cf. Horace, *Odes* IV xii 16–17). A passage in Pliny's *Natural History* describes the tests by which genuine nard can be distinguished from inferior or adulterated imitations (Pliny, *H. N.* XII xii). *She broke the cruse*, probably by snapping off the neck of the phial, perhaps as an indication that the whole of the contents were being lavished upon Jesus, and that the phial itself, after having served so sacred a purpose, should never be subsequently profaned by common use. Some, however, think that the detail is influenced by the symbolism of the story: in the Hellenistic Age it was usual, after anointing the dead, to break the flask and lay it in the coffin.

4. *There were some.* Mt has *when the disciples saw it*, and D and some Latin MSS. introduce the disciples here. Since the normal tendency in Mt is to spare the disciples, it is possible that Mt xxvi 8 should be regarded as confirming the text of D as the original reading in the present passage of Mk.

5. *They murmured against her*: the same strong verb is used here in the Greek as in i 43 (see notes *ad loc.*).

8. *She hath done what she could.* The commentators compare xii 44, but the meaning here is not 'she has spent her all', but rather 'she has done all that she could do in the circumstances'. The custom of anointing the dead body before burial is not (as has been alleged by Preuschen and others) a non-Jewish usage, since there is evidence for it in a passage of the Mishnah, in which it is laid down that a dead body, provided only that the limbs be not moved, may be washed and anointed even on the Sabbath.

9. The phrase 'to preach the Gospel' belongs to the missionary vocabulary of the Gentile-Christian Church: see Additional Notes, p. 251. It is possible that the kernel of this verse may go back to our Lord, though the wording has been recast. Many critics think that the whole verse is a later addition, expressing what had *de facto* come to be the case, viz. that this episode had come to form an integral part of the Gospel of the Passion as proclaimed by the Church. It is strange that, though the story is said to be *spoken of for a memorial* of the woman, her name is not given.

10–11. *The treachery of Judas*

(Cf. Mt xxvi 14–16; Lk xxii 3–6)

10 And Judas Iscariot, he that was one of the twelve,[1] went away unto the chief priests, that he might deliver him unto

---

[1] Gr. *the one of the twelve.*

11 them. And they, when they heard it, were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently deliver him *unto them.*

The treachery of Judas stands in dramatic contrast with the love and devotion shown by the woman who anointed Jesus. Nothing is said in Mk as to the motives of the betrayer. Jn xii 6 alleges avarice and peculation, and connects Judas' action with disappointment at the loss of the potential value of the nard. Whatever be the truth about this, mere avarice is hardly sufficient as a motive by itself. No doubt Loisy is right in saying that Judas, who as *one of the twelve* must at one time have been a genuine disciple of Jesus, had for some reason ceased to believe in Him, presumably because it had by now become clear that the Messiahship which Jesus claimed was not of the kind for which Judas had hoped, and that danger lay ahead for those who adhered to Him. What Judas betrayed to the High Priests was neither the secret of the Messiahship (as Schweitzer believes) nor the fact of the Anointing at Bethany (as Bacon has maintained—see above), but the place where Jesus would be likely to be found at night (i. e. in Gethsemane: cf. Jn. xviii 2).

10. *He that was one of the twelve*: see R.V. mg. The Greek phrase is an odd one, though there is a parallel in the Greek version of Enoch xx 1 sqq. (cf. also 1 Thess v 11), and it has been maintained that in vulgar Greek the meaning need be no more than simply 'one of the twelve'. Probably, however, there is a reference back to iii 19, and the meaning is 'the Judas who has already been mentioned as belonging to the twelve'. Another suggestion is that a distinction is implied between 'the Judas who belonged to the twelve' and some other well-known Judas who did *not* belong to the twelve (i. e. Judas the brother of Jesus? cf. vi 3. Mk differs from Lk and Jn in reckoning only one Judas among the most intimate circle of our Lord's disciples—Mk iii 16–19: contrast Lk vi 16, Jn xiv 22—and Judas the Lord's brother is the only other Judas mentioned in this Gospel). The suggestion of A. Wright in *J.T.S.* xviii 32 sqq., that the phrase means that Judas was at one time 'the first of the twelve' is not likely to be right, though it would be a possible translation of the Greek.

11. *Promised to give him money.* Mt's definite sum, *thirty pieces of silver* (Mt xxvi 15), is perhaps derived by inference from Zech xi 12. *He sought how he might conveniently deliver him*: the words mean 'he began to be on the look out for a suitable opportunity to hand Him over' to the Chief Priests.

12–16. *Preparations for the Passover*

(Cf. Mt xxvi 17–19 ; Lk xxii 7–13)

12 And on the first day of unleavened bread, when they
sacrificed the passover, his disciples say unto him, Where
wilt thou that we go and make ready that thou mayest eat
13 the passover? And he sendeth two of his disciples, and
saith unto them, Go into the city, and there shall meet you
14 a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him; and wheresoever
he shall enter in, say to the goodman of the house,
The Master[1] saith, Where is my guest-chamber, where
15 I shall eat the passover with my disciples? And he will
himself shew you a large upper room furnished *and* ready:
16 and there make ready for us. And the disciples went
forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto
them: and they made ready the passover.

---

[1] Or, *Teacher*.

Modern Jewish and Christian scholars, including Dalman and W. C. Allen, have contended that the phrase *on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover* involves a contradiction in terms, since the first day of Unleavened Bread, according to Jewish reckoning, was the day *after* that on which the Passover was killed. Mk writes probably in accordance with what may have been popular usage, and in any case he means Nisan 14, the day on which the Paschal lambs were slain. On the Synoptic identification of the Last Supper with the Passover see Additional Notes, pp. 262 sqq. Assuming that the Last Supper really *was* the Passover, or at least that it was eaten in a room which had been got ready for the purpose of the Paschal meal, it is probable that we ought to regard the *man bearing a pitcher of water* as a signal which had been secretly prearranged between our Lord and the owner of the room. On this hypothesis, the treachery of Judas is already known to, or guessed by, Jesus, and it is important that the traitor should not know (until he actually found himself with our Lord and the other disciples involved in the meal itself, and too late to prevent it) where the last meal of Jesus with His disciples is going to be held. Even the two disciples who are sent in advance to make preparations are kept in the dark (contrast Mt xxvi 18). They will be guided to the house by a man whom they will meet. Waterpots in the East are carried normally by women. A *man* bearing a waterpot would be both unusual and conspicuous: they are to follow such a man, and subsequently to ask a prearranged question of the owner of the house which he enters: and the *large upper room*, spread with couches for the projected meal, will be found to be in readiness. It has been attractively conjectured that the house at which the Last Supper was eaten may have been the home of John Mark himself, to whom the authorship of this Gospel is ascribed (cf. Acts xii 12 sqq.).[1] The further conjecture that he is to be identified with the *man bearing a pitcher of water* is improbable, since the water-carrier would be more likely to be a slave than the son of the house. On the *young man* of verse 51 see notes *ad loc.* It was obligatory upon religious grounds to eat the Passover in Jerusalem itself, and it was by custom incumbent upon householders within the city to show hospitality to pilgrims. Our Lord, therefore, if He was to eat the Passover with His disciples, must on this occasion spend the evening in Jerusalem: and on the other hand no great difficulty need be anticipated with regard to the provision of the room, apart from the fact that the house chosen would be naturally that of a friend. It is thought by Swete, Wellhausen, and others that Mk's narrative in this section is to be taken as implying supernatural foresight on the part of our Lord (cf. xi 1–10), and Wellhausen regards the story—on that ground among others—as unhistorical. The scepticism of Wellhausen is quite needless, but on the other hand it is equally unnecessary to suppose that any miracle was involved; though it is possible that Mk's earliest readers, and perhaps Mk. himself, interpreted the story as it is interpreted by Swete, i. e. as involving a miracle. The Gospel is written 'from faith to faith', and to the Christian community the Passion of Jesus is from first to last a solemn mystery of God. The point of view from which the story is told is that of a religious faith to which nothing is impossible, and from which the spirit of modern rationalism is wholly alien.

12. *Where wilt thou that we go and make ready?* Apart from the provision of the Paschal lamb, which would be brought from the Temple to be roasted at the last moment, the preparations would include the arrangement of the room and the provision of bitter herbs, unleavened bread, the sauce called *Charoseth*, wine, water, &c.

13. *Two of his disciples*: according to Lk xxii 8 they were Peter and John.

14. *Where is my guest-chamber?* Some commentators descry a touch of Messianic majesty in this demand for 'My' guest-chamber: others interpret simply as meaning 'the guest-chamber destined for me', and regard the phrase as confirming the suggestion of a previous arrangement with the host.

15. *Furnished*: lit. 'strewn', i. e. with carpets and cushions. A low table would also be provided, and presumably the other things needed for the meal.

---

[1] Sanday (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, pp. 77 sqq.) thinks that the evidence favours the view that the traditional site of the Cenaculum is authentic, the earliest Christian Church in Jerusalem having been built on the site of the house where the earliest Christians assembled.

17–21. *The Last Supper*

(Cf. Mt xxvi 20–25; Lk. xxii 14, 21–23)

17 And when it was evening he cometh with the twelve.
18 And as they sat[1] and were eating, Jesus said, Verily I say
unto you, One of you shall betray me, *even* he that eateth
19 with me. They began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him
20 one by one, Is it I? And he said unto them, *It is* one of
21 the twelve, he that dippeth with me in the dish. For the
Son of man goeth, even as it is written of him: but woe
unto that man through whom the Son of man is betrayed!
good were it for that man[2] if he had not been born.

[1] Gr. *reclined.*

[2] Gr. *for him if that man.*

The story of the Last Supper is very briefly told. The Church for which Mk was writing was interested only in two points connected with it, viz. (1) Jesus' foresight in respect of the betrayer, and (2) the institution of the Eucharist. Lk, whose narrative diverges considerably from that of Mk in these closing scenes of the Gospel, and who was clearly following an independent tradition, reverses the order of the two episodes, placing the prediction of betrayal *after* the Eucharistic Institution (Lk xxii 21–23).

The interest of the earliest Church in our Lord's anticipation of betrayal, as in the predictions ascribed to Him in general, was largely apologetic and doctrinal. It was part of the preaching of the Gospel to maintain that Jesus had not been taken by surprise, as also that all things had happened in accordance with the *determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God* (Acts ii 23). It is nevertheless probable that the substance of the sayings here ascribed to Jesus is historical, and if so, His words are best understood as being addressed indirectly to Judas, at once as a warning and as a final appeal of love. The Lord intimates to the disciples generally that He is about to be betrayed by one of themselves, by one of his actual table-companions (an allusion is probably intended to Ps xli 9; cf. Jn xiii 18): it is thereby made clear to Judas both that his treachery is known, and also that Jesus by withholding his name is nevertheless deliberately leaving Himself in his power: he is free, if he so chooses, to carry out still his bargain with the priests, though with the Lord's solemn words of warning, *Woe unto that man, &c.*, echoing in his ears. The view of J. Weiss that Judas, after his visit to *the chief priests* in verse 10, was not again in our Lord's company until he arrived at the head of the armed mob in Gethsemane (ver. 43), is answered adequately by Loisy: it was the very condition of the success of Judas' treason that he should maintain till the last moment the outward appearance of fidelity. The presence of Judas at the Last Supper is implied in Mk just as much as in Mt (cf. Mt xxvi 25). On the other hand, it is not suggested in Mk that the traitor was *directly* indicated by our Lord, or that he went out from the company before the end of the meal (contrast Jn xiii 26–30). The Marcan story, taken by itself, would rather make it natural to think of Judas as having slipped away to fetch the armed band for the arrest of our Lord when the company after supper *went out unto the mount of Olives* (ver. 26), that is to say, as soon as it had become clear that they were bound for Gethsemane.

17. *When it was evening.* The Paschal meal (and the Last Supper, at least in Mk's view of it, was a Passover) was begun after nightfall. *The twelve* is here a conventional designation (as in 1 Cor xv 5): strictly speaking there were ten, since two disciples had already been sent on ahead.

18. *As they sat*: R.V. mg. 'reclined' is more accurate. The Passover was originally eaten standing (Ex xii 11), but it had become customary to recline, as at an ordinary meal. The guests lay on carpets, with their elbows resting on cushions. *He that eateth with me* is subsequently paraphrased and strengthened (ver. 20) as *he that dippeth with me in the dish.* The phrase is probably metaphorical (cf. Ps xli 9), not a definite indication of the traitor. Some critics think the Lucan form of the saying, viz. *Behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table* (Lk xxii 21) is likely to be closer to what our Lord actually said.

19. *Is it I?* Translate rather, 'Surely it is not I?'

20. *He that dippeth with me in the dish.* If the meal is a Passover, the allusion is probably to the sauce *Charoseth*, a compound of dates, raisins, and vinegar, in which the bread and bitter herbs were dipped.

21. *The Son of man goeth*, i.e. to death (cf. Jn viii 14, 21 sqq., xiii 3, 33 sqq., xiv 4 sqq.). *Woe unto that man*: not to be taken as a curse, but in the sense of xiii 17; cf. Mt xviii 7, Lk xvii 1–2. There is a parallel to the last words of the verse in Eth En xxxviii 2.

22–25. *The Institution of the Eucharist*

(Cf. Mt xxvi 26–29; Lk xxii 15–20; 1 Cor xi 23–25)

22 And as they were eating, he took bread,[1] and when he had
blessed, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye:
23 this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had
given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it.

---

[1] Or, *a loaf.*

24 And he said unto them, This is my blood of the[1] covenant,[2]
25 which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

[1] Some ancient authorities insert *new*.
[2] Or, *the testament*.

The interest of this narrative for Mk's readers is aetiological; that is to say, its purpose is to explain the Eucharist as a familiar sacrament of the Church, by tracing it back to its origin in what Jesus said and did at the Last Supper. The command to repeat the observance as a perpetual memorial is found only in S. Paul (1 Cor xi 24, 25) and in the *textus receptus* of Lk xxii 19–20, which is thought to have been influenced by S. Paul.[1] For Mk and his readers it goes without saying that Jesus was instituting a permanent sacrament, nor need it be doubted that the Eucharist historically arose out of what the Lord did and said at the Last Supper, or that the Church in perpetuating it was rightly interpreting His will. See on this D. S. Guy, *Was Holy Communion Instituted by Jesus? A Candid Enquiry* (S.C.M. 1924). The probable meaning of the Eucharist in its original setting (i.e. in the actual circumstances of the Last Supper) has been elaborately discussed, on the assumption that the Last Supper was a Passover, by G. Dalman in *Jesus-Jeschua*, pp. 98–166: and on the assumption that the Last Supper was not, strictly speaking, a Passover, by R. H. Kennett in *The Last Supper: Its Significance in the Upper Room* (Cambridge, 1921). It is obvious that in view of the variations between the different Gospel traditions, and the somewhat fragmentary character of the evidence, there must always be involved in any such attempts at reconstruction a considerable element of conjecture; and, further, that the fullest significance of the Eucharist has not been grasped until the question has been asked, not merely 'What meaning was intended at the time?' but also 'What meaning, in the light of events, was discovered subsequently in the Eucharist by the faith and experience of the Christian Church under the guidance of the Spirit?' It is probable that those are right who have suggested that our Lord had for long been in the habit, in accordance with Jewish religious custom, of offering the solemn thanksgiving over food on behalf of the whole of the little company of which He was the head, and also perhaps that there was something especially characteristic about His manner of doing so (cf. vi 41 and notes *ad loc.*). The ceremonial taking of the bread, the utterance of the thanksgiving or blessing,[2] the breaking of the *loaf* (R.V. mg.) into small pieces for distribution[1]—all would be, so far, in accordance with the usage to which the disciples were already accustomed. 'The institution of the Eucharist appears to have connexions both backwards and forwards—backwards with other meals which our Lord ate together with His disciples, forwards with those common meals which very early came into existence in the Apostolic Church.'[2] The circumstances of the Last Supper, the probably Paschal associations of the meal, the atmosphere of impending danger and crisis, must have given on this occasion an added significance to what may have been, in the sense indicated, a familiar observance.

---

[1] The problems presented by the shorter text of Lk xxii 17 sqq., which omits verses 19 b–20, cannot here be discussed.

[2] The blessing, according to Jewish usage, would not be understood as a hallowing or consecration of the bread (except indirectly), but as a thanks-

That our Lord's life was in danger must by this time have been clear not only to Jesus but to the disciples.[3] To the Semite, as to the Oriental generally, the bond of table-fellowship meant far more than it means in modern Western usage: it was already a kind of sacrament. The little group of men who in the Upper Room at Jerusalem received in common at the hands of their Master the bread over which He had given thanks, and who drank successively of the loving-cup which He passed round, will have been conscious of being thereby linked together in a peculiarly intimate and sacred bond of fellowship at once with Him and with one another.

But the Lord, on this the last occasion on which He broke bread with the disciples, not only does what He has hitherto been accustomed to do, but He does more: He describes the bread which He gives as His Body, and the wine, over which in like manner He proceeds to give thanks, as His Blood, as *My blood of the covenant, which is shed for many.* He is seeking to prepare their minds for that which is to come, to interpret beforehand the significance of His coming death. 'In substance the supper was an act of self-dedication in which Jesus "covenanted"[4] that the life He was willingly surrendering in the cause of the Kingdom should be a sacrifice to God on Israel's behalf. As other Jewish martyrs had done before His time (4 Macc vi 27–29, xvii 8–22), He offered His body and blood to God as a "propitiation" on behalf of His people, and in a faith

---

giving directed to God. Dalman thinks that our Lord probably used some such form of words as 'Praised be Thou, our Father in heaven, who givest us this day our necessary bread.' The normal Jewish form appears to have been 'Praised be Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who bringest forth bread from the earth.'

[1] The idea of the 'breaking' of our Lord's body as a symbol of dissolution in death is not prominent in early Christian Eucharistic thought. It is unlikely that the word *broken* is genuine in the text of 1 Cor xi 24, and the Paschal symbolism suggested rather the contrary idea (cf. Jn xix 33–36).

[2] Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 162. See, however, with reference to such supposed 'common meals' in the Apostolic Church, the essay by Batiffol to which reference is made in the note on p. 85.

[3] Two of them had brought swords to the Last Supper (Lk xxii 38), and at the time of the arrest a blow was struck in our Lord's defence (Mk xiv 47).

[4] Lk xxii 29 'I covenant with you as My Father hath covenanted with me a Kingdom'.

which not even the shadow of the cross could darken, He gave tryst to those who had been with Him in His trials at the banquet of the redeemed. He would meet them again at His table in His Kingdom. . . . As 2 Macc vii 36 says of the martyrs who "offered up both body and life for the laws of their fathers, entreating God that He would speedily be propitiated for their nation", Jesus also "died under a God-given *covenant* of everlasting life".'[1] Jesus, then, thought of His blood as being 'covenant blood' (cf. Ex xxiv 8, Zech ix 11). It is even possible that He may have thought of His death explicitly as having a wider reference than that of the redemption of Israel merely, that He was consciously about to die (as Jn xi 52 expresses it) *not for the nation only, but that he might also gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad.* It is probable that He has in mind not merely the thought of the Passover, commemorative of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, or that of the covenant-sacrifice at Sinai, of which the actual phrase *blood of the covenant* appears to be an echo, but that He thinks also of the Isaianic figure of the Servant of the Lord, with whose vocation He has long been accustomed to identify His own, and who was called *to give his life a ransom for many* (see notes on x 45 *supra*). The phrase *for many* in verse 24 of the present passage, as in x 45, is a clear echo of Is liii 11–12, and the Servant's offered life is not for Israel only. Attention has been called by Dalman to the description of the Servant in Is xlii 6, as being given *for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles* (the former of these phrases occurs also in Is xlix 8), and Dalman would connect the idea of the 'covenant' quite specifically with that of the Servant of the Lord, pointing out that it is only by putting together Is xlii 6, xlix 8 with Is liii 10–12 that any connexion is discoverable in the O.T. between the idea of a Divine Covenant and the death of a Mediator.[2] If this suggestion of Dalman's be considered too ingenious, it is probably necessary to fall back upon Ex xxiv 8 as the source of the 'covenant' idea, and to interpret the passage as a whole in the light of the general Jewish conception of the propitiatory value of martyrdom. The martyrdom of God's Messiah would from this point of view be the Absolute Martyrdom, and it was to this that the Scriptures pointed, when once the conception of Messiahship was interpreted (as it was by our Lord) in terms of the conceptions of service and of suffering.

23. *He took a cup.* S. Paul's phrase *the cup of blessing* (1 Cor x 16) suggests the third of the successive cups drunk at the Passover meal, which was so named: on the other hand, it is said that the Paschal 'cup of blessing' was not passed round as a loving-cup, but was a separate wine-cup drunk by each man individually. Either there is some departure from the normal ritual, or (more probably) our Lord's action is not based directly on the Paschal ritual at all. *They*

---

[1] B. W. Bacon, *Jesus and Paul*, pp. 7–8.
[2] Dalman, *Jesus-Jeschua*, p. 154.

all drank of it: including Judas (to whom Jesus thus makes a supreme and most poignant appeal), but excluding the Master Himself (Lk xxii 17–18).

24. *Testament* (R.V. mg.) instead of *covenant* would be a possible rendering of the Greek word here (cf. Heb ix 16 sqq.), but an impossible rendering of the underlying Hebrew idea of the *berîth* or covenant of grace made by God with His people. The reading *new covenant* (R.V. mg.) is presumably the result of assimilation in some MSS. to the text of S. Paul, who in 1 Cor xi 25 has *This cup is the new covenant in my blood.* But S. Paul is thinking of Jer. xxxi 31.

25. For the banquet metaphor as applied to the coming Kingdom of God cf. Mt viii 11, Lk xxii 30: also Eth En lxii 14, 2 Baruch xxix 5 sqq., 2 Esdras vi 51 sq., Pirke Aboth iii 20. It is not necessary to take the symbolism with prosaic literalness. The ordinary Jewish form of thanksgiving over the wine-cup included the words 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God . . . the Creator of *the fruit of the vine*'.

26–31. *S. Peter's Denial Foretold*

(Cf. Mt xxvi 30–35; Lk xxii 39, 31–34)

26 And when they had sung a hymn, they went out unto the mount of Olives.

27 And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended:[1]
for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the
28 sheep shall be scattered abroad. Howbeit, after I am
29 raised up, I will go before you into Galilee. But Peter
said unto him, Although all shall be offended,[1] yet will
30 not I. And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee,
that thou to-day, *even* this night, before the cock crow
31 twice, shalt deny me thrice. But he spake exceeding
vehemently, If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee.
And in like manner also said they all.

[1] Gr. *caused to stumble.*

'In the description of these last hours before Jesus is taken prisoner, as in the whole story of the Passion up to this point, the effort is everywhere made in the Christian tradition to set forth clearly and plainly the two points (1) that Jesus even in details foresaw His fate, and (2) that what happened was in correspondence with the prophecies of the Old Testament. By means of such an appeal to the predictions of Jesus and to Old Testament prophecy every occasion of stumbling for Christian readers was removed.'[1]

---

[1] G. Bertram, *Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult*, p. 42.

The story of how the disciples, when the decisive moment came, forsook their Master in the Garden, and of S. Peter's threefold denial of his allegiance, apart from such explanation as the arguments from prophecy and prediction appeared to afford, must certainly have appeared likely to cause distress to Christian readers at Rome, were it not for the subsequent rehabilitation of S. Peter by the risen Master, and the presumably recent memory of his glorious martyrdom in the midst of the very Church for which Mk is writing. The defection of Peter after loud protestations of loyalty, his bitter remorse, and his eventual restoration to his former position as leader and chief of the Apostles, made clearly a profound impression upon the mind of the earliest Church. Mk xvi 7, before the story in the genuine text breaks off (see notes *ad loc.*) is clearly leading up to an appearance of the risen Lord to the penitent Apostle: cf. also 1 Cor xv 5, Jn xxi 15 sqq. That Jesus foresaw or anticipated the defection of S. Peter and of the rest of the twelve is psychologically probable, though it is possible that the precision in detail of the correspondence between prediction and fulfilment is due to *ex post facto* modifications of the tradition. The same tendency to modify in the direction of a more precise correspondence between fulfilment and prediction is probably the explanation of the variations of reading in the text of xiv 30, 68, 72: see notes on the verses in question.

26. If the meal was the Paschal meal, the *hymn* sung would be the customary 'Hallel' Psalms, i.e. Pss 113–118. On the other hand, it is enjoined in Dt xvi 7 that the night should be spent in the same place in which the Paschal meal was eaten. Even so it is probable that it would be legitimate after midnight to go outside the city.

27. On the verb translated *be offended* see notes on iv 17. The Scriptural quotation is from Zech xiii 7, though the wording has been adapted: the original, both in the Heb. and in the LXX, has the imperative—*Smite the shepherd, &c.*

28. The verse is difficult in this context, and is omitted in the text of the so-called Fayoum Gospel-Fragment.[1] Its purpose here is to prepare for the reference back to it in xvi 7, on which see notes *ad loc.* and Additional Notes, pp. 267 sqq.

30. *To-day, even this night*: the phrase is not a contradiction in terms, since according to Jewish reckoning the following day had already begun with nightfall. The reference to the cock crowing *twice* is peculiar to Mk, and there is MS. evidence for its omission even in Mk. It is confirmed, however, by the Fayoum fragment and is probably genuine here. On the other hand, the words *and the cock*

---

[1] E.T. in M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 25: Gk. text in E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, pp. 21–22. The fragment only extends to some six or eight short lines: its date is uncertain, and it is disputed whether it is really a fragment of an early MS. of Mk or Mt or a mutilated quotation made by a commentator or preacher.

crew in verse 68 are possibly an insertion. It is said that cocks were forbidden to be kept in Jerusalem: on the other hand, there seems to be evidence of exceptions to this rule (cf. Strack and Billerbeck i 992). 'Cock-crow' was a proverbial expression for early morning, and there is evidence in classical writers for a *double* cock-crowing (*sc.* one bird answering another) being referred to as a designation of time (cf. Aristoph Eccl 390 sq., Juv ix 107 sq.). Some commentators think that originally the meaning here was simply 'before cock-crow', but that Mk took it literally and provided in the sequel for the literal crowing of a cock or cocks (verses 68, 72). C. H. Mayo in the *J. T. S.* for July 1921 suggests that the reference is to the signal given by trumpet for the changing of guard by the Roman garrison in occupation of the Castle Antonia, which dominated Jerusalem. The Romans divided the night into four watches, and the guard seems to have been changed at the end of the third watch, when the signal known as *gallicinium* (i.e. 'cock-crowing') was blown by a bugle which would be clearly audible in the city.[1] For our Lord's familiarity with the popular names of the four Roman watches (including 'cock-crowing') cf. xiii 35.

31. S. Peter's vehement assertion is fully in keeping with his character, though at the time our Lord's words in Jn xiii 36 held good of him, *sc. Thou canst not follow me now.* By the time Mk wrote, the further words ascribed in Jn xiii 36 to Jesus had found their fulfilment, *sc. Thou shalt follow afterwards.* Loisy thinks it is implied that not only S. Peter but the majority of the twelve had by this time suffered martyrdom.

32–42. *Gethsemane*

(Cf. Mt xxvi 36–46; Lk xxii 40–46)

32 And they come unto a place[1] which was named Gethsemane: and he saith unto his disciples, Sit ye here, while
33 I pray. And he taketh with him Peter and James and John, and began to be greatly amazed, and sore troubled.
34 And he saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful even
35 unto death: abide ye here, and watch. And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were
36 possible, the hour might pass away from him. And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will, but what thou

[1] Gr. *an enclosed piece of ground.*

---

[1] C. H. Mayo, *S. Peter's Token of the Cock Crow* (*J. T. S.* xxii, pp. 367 sqq.).

37 wilt. And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith
unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou? couldest thou not watch
38 one hour? Watch and pray,[1] that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.
39 And again he went away, and prayed, saying the same
40 words. And again he came, and found them sleeping, for
their eyes were very heavy; and they wist not what to
41 answer him. And he cometh the third time, and saith unto
them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: it is enough; the
hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the
42 hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going: behold, he that
betrayeth me is at hand.

[1] Or, *Watch ye, and pray that ye enter not.*

With this scene as described by Mk should be compared the shorter and apparently independent version of Lk xxii 40–46. The basis of the story is certainly historical and beyond the reach of invention. For the impression made upon the mind of the Church cf. Heb v 7–10 and perhaps also Philipp ii 8. The agony of Jesus is described in terms which express shuddering awe, amazement, deep distress (verse 33), and it is an agony which the disciples cannot share. The spiritual solitude of Jesus is emphasized in Mk by the division of the disciples into two groups, the main body who are left behind at the entrance to the *place which was named Gethsemane*, and the chosen three (cf. v 37, ix 2) who are closer to Jesus, and from whom He seeks companionship and sympathy, only to find them repeatedly sunk in shameful sleep, and quite unable to share His vigil. That the disciples slept in the garden must be historical reminiscence, but the extreme emphasis which is laid upon this in Mk and Mt by the statement that our Lord three times went apart for solitary prayer and three times returned to find the disciples asleep (contrast Lk's account) may possibly be due to a development of the story in which the influence may be discernible of Mk's reiterated disposition to lay stress upon the spiritual blindness of the disciples during the period of their companionship with Jesus upon earth (cf. iv 13, 40, 41, vi 50–52, vii 18, viii 16–21, ix 5–6, x 24), a spiritual blindness which Mk perhaps regarded as being due to a supernatural 'hardening' of their hearts (cf. vi 52, viii 17–18; and see Additional Notes, pp. 260 sq.). There are curious points of contact with the Transfiguration story, as though Mk looked upon the Saviour's spiritual anguish in Gethsemane as being, like the Transfiguration, the revelation of a supernatural mystery, which the chosen three are invited to witness, but which they fail signally to comprehend. The statement in verse 40 that *they wist not what to answer him* is closely parallel to the statement that Peter *wist not what to answer* in ix 6, and, still more curiously, the statement in Lk's account of the Transfiguration (Lk ix 32) that *Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep* is parallel to the statement that *their eyes were very heavy* in Mk xiv 40. It may be observed, further, that for the Church of Mk's day the example of Jesus in the Garden, as contrasted with the behaviour of the three disciples, must have had special value as setting forth the spirit in which the vocation to martyrdom should be approached. The Christian witness must not presume upon the fact that his spirit is willing: he must ever be mindful also of the weakness of the flesh. It is essential therefore that he should *watch and pray*, that when the hour of trial comes he may not break down. Had Peter and the rest (it is perhaps implied) kept vigil in the Garden, they might have stood firm instead of forsaking their Lord at the time of the arrest. The parallel is perhaps intentional between S. Peter's subsequent three denials and the three occasions on which in the Garden he is found to be asleep. It is noticeable that the prayer which is here ascribed to Jesus is essentially the expression of the shrinking of His human spirit from the 'Cup' of the Passion (cf. x 38), a shrinking which is nevertheless brought into line with a petition which is virtually an echo of the words of the *Pater Noster*, *sc. howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt* (cf. *Father* . . . *Thy will be done*). There seems also to be a further allusion to the *Pater Noster* in the words which are addressed to the disciples, *sc. pray, that ye enter not into temptation.* The critics who have somewhat prosaically asked how the disciples could have known what our Lord was praying when He was away from them, or when they were asleep, are well answered by H. G. Wood, who remarks that if the disciples 'were not physically close enough to Jesus to hear the words of His prayer, then, later, they must have been spiritually close enough to interpret the scene aright'.

32. The *place* (see R.V. mg.) is probably an enclosed garden, apparently an olive-plantation: the word *Gethsemane* means 'an oil-press'. According to Jn xviii 1 it was just on the other side of *the brook Kidron*, and was a favourite haunt of Jesus and His disciples.

33. The verb translated *greatly amazed* occurs also in ix 15 and xvi 5, 6, and is a strong expression, suggestive of shuddering awe, as of one conscious of being in the presence of a supernatural mystery which excites terror. The word translated *sore troubled* occurs in Philipp ii 26.

34. Cf. Ps xlii 6 (LXX), Jonah iv 9. Swete is probably right in thinking that the meaning is 'sorrow which well-nigh kills', rather than (as Klostermann and others suppose) a sorrow so great that death were to be preferred. Jdgs xvi 16, 1 Kgs xix 4, Ecclus xxxvii 2 are quoted in favour of the latter interpretation; Ecclus li 6, Ps lxxxviii 3 in favour of the former.

35. *If it were possible*, i.e. consistently with the fulfilment of God's purposes; *the hour might pass away from him*, i.e. without

involving the suffering from which He shrank. For *the hour* as a quasi-technical term cf. Jn ii 4, vii 30, viii 20, xii 23, xiii 1, xvi 21, xvii 1. Klostermann takes it as meaning 'the hour of destiny', and thinks the idiom is derived ultimately from the language of astrology.

36. *Abba, Father*: cf. Rom viii 15, Gal iv 6. The word *abba* in Aramaic means *father.* Mk like S. Paul gives the Aramaic original and the Greek equivalent side by side. It seems probable that the double formula was current in Greek-speaking Christianity as the recognized beginning of the *Pater Noster* (so Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, p. 24, to whom Swete refers here).

37. Whereas the next verse is addressed in the plural to all three disciples, the address here to S. Peter in the singular is emphatic. The man who had professed his readiness to die with his Master (verse 31) is not capable of keeping vigil for an hour. The name *Simon* is used here for the first time since iii 16, but it is probably reading too much into it to say with Swete that 'for the time he is "Peter" no more; the new character which he owes to association with Jesus is in abeyance'. Cf. however Jn xxi 15 sqq.

38. The address here passes into the plural, and indeed the words read like an injunction to Christians generally. H. G. Wood quotes Réville as suggesting that the saying about the spirit and the flesh was 'obviously spoken by Jesus of Himself, and did not merely refer to the sleeping condition of the disciples'. Others think the saying in question may be a traditional *logion* of Jesus from some other context. 'The words spirit and flesh are here used, not as in Paul where the spirit is an element higher than man's normal constitution which enters a man when he becomes a Christian, but according to ordinary usage such as prevails even among ourselves' (Menzies).

39. *Saying the same words*: translate rather 'uttering the same petition'. D and some Old Latin MSS. omit. Mt xxvi 42 suggests a slight variation in the phrasing of our Lord's prayer on the second occasion, so calculated as to suggest that Jesus has by now attained to a calmer acceptance of the Divine will, together with a growing realization that the 'Cup' *cannot pass away, except* He *drink it.*

41. Our Lord's opening words here are better read as a question than as an ironical imperative, *sc.* 'Are you still sleeping on, then, and taking your rest?' The word rendered *It is enough* is difficult, and is omitted by Mt, and also by one MS. of the Syriac version of Mk. The translation *it is enough* is derived from the Vulgate, which has *sufficit*, but the Greek word is rarely found in this sense. Moulton and Milligan[1] refer to an article by de Zwaan in *The Expositor* (VI xii, pp. 452 sqq.) in which the evidence is produced from papyri to show that the word is used on receipt-forms. The meaning suggested is 'He (Judas) has received his bribe': but this does not seem very convincing. The probability is that the Vulgate

---

[1] *Vocabulary of the Gk. Testament* i, pp. 57–58.

rendering is right, and the meaning will be simply 'Enough of sleep!' *Into the hands of sinners*: here not in the technical Jewish sense of Gentiles, or of Jews who have become outcasts from the Synagogue because of their lax attitude towards the Law, but in the more obvious meaning of 'sinful men', 'those who are the enemies of the Messiah' (Montefiore).

42. *Let us be going*, i. e. 'Let us go forth to meet them'. Our Lord is not thinking of flight. J. Weiss thinks that the meaning is that our Lord becomes sensible of the presence of the traitor even before he is there. It is more natural, however, to suppose that He sees or hears the approaching party. The disciples must not be found stretched supinely upon the ground.

43–50. *The Arrest*

(Cf. Mt xxvi 47–56; Lk xxii 47–53)

43 And straightway, while he yet spake, cometh Judas, one of the twelve, and with him a multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the
44 elders. Now he that betrayed him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that is he; take him, and
45 lead him away safely. And when he was come, straightway
46 he came to him, and saith, Rabbi; and kissed him.[1] And
47 they laid hands on him, and took him. But a certain one of them that stood by drew his sword, and smote the
48 servant[2] of the high priest, and struck off his ear. And Jesus answered and said unto them, Are ye come out, as against a robber, with swords and staves to seize me?
49 I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye took me not: but *this is done* that the scriptures might be ful-
50 filled. And they all left him, and fled.

[1] Gr. *kissed him much.* [2] Gr. *bondservant.*

According to Mk our Lord was arrested by authority of the Sanhedrin: *the multitude with swords and staves* comes *from the chief priests and scribes and elders* (cf. viii 31, xi 27). The Sanhedrin, though its powers were limited under the Roman administration, nevertheless 'had an independent authority in regard to police affairs, and consequently possessed the right of ordering arrests to be made by its own officers'.[1] The arresting party would probably therefore consist of a detachment of the Temple police, armed with swords and clubs, though some commentators think rather of a hastily armed rabble who had been assembled *ad hoc*. The Fourth Gospel (less probably) seems to imply a detachment of Roman soldiers under a military tribune (Jn xviii 3, 12).[1] That Judas was *one of the twelve* is again emphasized (cf. xiv 10, 20): the phrase seems to be added, as Lagrange expresses it, as 'a note of infamy attached to his name'. For the treacherous *kiss* cf. 2 Sam xx 9, Prov xxvii 6. A kiss seems to have been the customary method of saluting a rabbi. The verb here used implies that Judas kissed our Lord with exaggerated fervour (R.V. mg.). For the term *Rabbi*, left untranslated, as here, cf. ix 5, xi 21: elsewhere in numerous passages Mk has the Greek equivalent (= 'teacher'). The person described as *a certain one of them that stood by*, who—too late—strikes a blow in our Lord's defence, is presumably one of the disciples, though this is not stated in Mk. According to Jn xviii 10 the blow was struck by Peter. Lk xxii 38 implies that two of our Lord's company were armed: it would be not unnatural to think of the two disciples who had been sent on ahead to prepare for the Passover (Mk xiv 13) as having bought swords in the city under the impression that danger was impending. Jn xviii 10 gives the name of the wounded 'slave of the high-priest' as Malchus—a common name at the period—and Lk xxii 51 asserts that our Lord healed the wounded ear (a detail, however, which would be likely to be added to the story as time went on). Jesus protests in dignified words against the manner of the arrest. The authorities are behaving as though He were an armed bandit (like the Barabbas who was subsequently preferred to Him: cf. xv 6 sqq.): His *rôle* had been that of a Teacher, and if they had wished to arrest Him, He might have been taken while teaching in the Temple. It seems to be implied that He had been teaching in Jerusalem for longer than two or three days, and it is possible that He had really been in the neighbourhood of the city for more than the brief period which Mk's narrative of Holy Week, taken strictly, would suggest. Apart from this, it is morally certain that our Lord must have visited Jerusalem repeatedly in the course of His ministry (see Introd., p. xx). It is not clear what precise passage of Scripture was in Mk's mind as forming the basis of the allusion in verse 49. Is liii 12 has been suggested. But by the time that Mk wrote it had become a fixed dogma of the Church that all the events of the Saviour's Passion, even down to the details, happened 'according to the Scriptures', and the phrase *that the scriptures might be fulfilled* might be introduced even though there were no very particularly apt passage of Scripture to be adduced. We must suppose that the disciples *all left him, and fled* immediately after the striking of the one futile sword-blow, thereby fulfilling the prophecy of xiv 27. A large number of modern interpreters have followed the Apocryphal *Gospel of Peter*[1] in assuming that the scattered disciples almost immediately returned in dismay to their homes in Galilee and continued their fishing (cf. Jn xxi). But this is certainly not the meaning of Mk, who assumes that the disciples are still in Jerusalem on the morning of the visit of the women to the tomb (cf. xvi 7). S. Peter, moreover, follows Jesus to *the court of the high priest* (xiv 54). The scattering and flight of the disciples refers then simply to the fact that they fled in confusion from Gethsemane: if the next days were spent in hiding, the place of hiding was not improbably Jerusalem, since their former haunts on the Mount of Olives and at Bethany would be known to the authorities through Judas' information.

---

[1] Schürer II i 187.

---

[1] It is possible, however, that the term *chiliarch* in Jn xviii 12, though it commonly signifies a Roman military tribune, is used loosely for the chief of the Temple guard, a Jewish force which was at the disposal of the Sanhedrin. So also the word translated 'band' need not mean a Roman cohort.

44. *A token.* The word in Greek means 'an agreed signal'. Jesus was of course well-known by sight, but Judas seems to have thought that a token of identification might be advisable to make assurance doubly sure in the shade of the olive-trees, even though at the time of the Passover the party could count upon bright moonlight.

48. *As against a robber.* The Greek word means 'a bandit'. The phrase is echoed in the account of the arrest of Polycarp before his martyrdom (*Mart. Polyc.* vii 1).

51–52. *The Young Man who fled*

51 And a certain young man followed with him, having
a linen cloth cast about him, over *his* naked *body*: and they
52 lay hold on him; but he left the linen cloth, and fled naked.

This curious little episode is omitted by both Mt and Lk. Some commentators think therefore that it is a later addition to the text of Mk. But if so, what was the point of it? It has been suggested that it was added in order to provide a fulfilment of prophecy (cf. Gen xxxix 12 or Amos ii 16?). But this does not seem very convincing. The story certainly reads like a personal reminiscence. The incident would clearly be memorable to the young man who was the subject of it, and, on the other hand, as has often been urged, it would hardly be memorable to any one else. The view that the young man was none other than S. Mark himself has been restated recently in a most attractive form by J. M. C. Crum, who supposes that Judas had left the Supper Room before Jesus and the rest of the disciples (cf. Jn xiii 30), and that he returned with the armed band in the first instance to the house where the supper had been held (identified by Crum with Mk's home), supposing that our Lord and the others would be still there. Recriminations pass, when it is discovered that this is not the case, between Judas and the party to which he is acting as guide, and Gethsemane is suggested as a probable place where Jesus may be found. Mk, who is in bed, hears what is happening, starts up, and throwing a sheet about him ('no time to dress!'), rushes on ahead to warn our Lord of what is afoot, but arrives too late for the warning to be effective, and is all but arrested himself.[1] Such a theory at least has the merit of explaining why the 'young man' should be in Gethsemane in a state bordering upon nudity, and would be in harmony with the fact that at a later stage *the house of Mary the mother of John whose surname was Mark* was a place of Christian assembly in Jerusalem (Acts xii 12).

---

[1] Text in English in M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 94; Gk. Text in Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, p. 20. It is worth noticing, however, that Ps.-Peter does not represent the disciples as returning to Galilee until after the conclusion of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

53–65. *Jesus examined before the Sanhedrin*

(Cf. Mt xxvi 57–68 ; Lk xxii 54–55, 63–71)

53 And they led Jesus away to the high priest: and there
come together with him all the chief priests and the elders
54 and the scribes. And Peter had followed him afar off, even
within, into the court of the high priest; and he was sitting
with the officers, and warming himself in the light *of the*
55 *fire*. Now the chief priests and the whole council sought
witness against Jesus to put him to death; and found it
56 not. For many bare false witness against him, and their
57 witness agreed not together. And there stood up certain,
58 and bare false witness against him, saying, We heard him
say, I will destroy this temple[1] that is made with hands,
and in three days I will build another made without
59 hands. And not even so did their witness agree together.
60 And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus,
saying, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these
61 witness against thee? But he held his peace, and answered
nothing. Again the high priest asked him, and saith unto

[1] Or, *sanctuary*.

---

[1] J. M. C. Crum, *Roadmending on the Sacred Way*, pp. 42, 43. Burkitt, however, in *J. T. S.* xvii, p. 296, thinks that a strict interpretation of *followed with him* in verse 51 implies that the 'young man' had followed with the rest of the party to Gethsemane when our Lord left the house in which the supper had been held.

62 him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus
said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the
right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.
63 And the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What
64 further need have we of witnesses? Ye have heard the
blasphemy: what think ye? And they all condemned him
65 to be worthy of[1] death. And some began to spit on him,
and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say unto
him, Prophesy: and the officers received him with blows of
their hands.[2]

[1] Gr. *liable to.* [2] Or, *strokes of rods.*

The account here given by Mk (who is followed by Mt), according to which Jesus, on being taken to the High Priest's house, was at once arraigned before a formal assembly of the Sanhedrin, should be contrasted with the Lucan and Johannine versions of what occurred. Lk implies that the Sanhedrin did not meet until the following morning (Lk xxii 66), though our Lord during the night was ill-used and insulted by the attendants who held Him in custody (Lk xxii 63–65). Jn does not appear to contemplate a formal meeting of the Sanhedrin at all, but speaks of a private investigation conducted by Annas (loosely described as 'High Priest', an office which he had formerly held, but from which he had been deposed), and of a subsequent reference of the case to Caiaphas, who was the actual High Priest at the time (Jn xviii 12–24). It is probable that if the Sanhedrin formally arraigned our Lord it would be in the morning rather than at night, and that Mk has ante-dated the meeting in question. On this view the assembly of Mk xv 1, which in the Marcan narrative as it stands appears as a short and hurried consultation merely ratifying the decision already taken, would be the real meeting of the Sanhedrin, corresponding to Lk xxii 66.

The proceedings before the Sanhedrin, as described in the Gospels, conflict at many points with the rules laid down in the Mishnah as governing the procedure of that body in capital cases,[1] and the whole process before the Sanhedrin has consequently been held to have been flagrantly illegal.[2] D. Chwolson, who is disposed to minimize the cleavage between our Lord and the Pharisees,[1] and thinks that the Pharisaic members of the Sanhedrin would not have voted in favour of a condemnation, believes that the proceedings of the Sanhedrin at this period were controlled by the Sadducees, who according to Josephus were 'very rigid in judging offenders',[2] and that the trial was not illegal from the point of view of Sadducaean jurisprudence, though it was conducted in opposition to the Pharisaic rules subsequently codified in the Mishnah.[3] More likely to be correct is the view of H. Danby, who points out that the tract *Sanhedrin* of the Mishnah represents an essentially theoretical account of the procedure of the Supreme Court of Judaism, the work of second-century Rabbis whose speculations date from a period subsequent to that at which the Sanhedrin as a working institution had ceased to exist,[4] and that no valid inferences can be drawn from the prescriptions of the Mishnah as to the rules which may have governed the actual procedure of the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem.[5]

---

[1] English translations of the relevant portions of the Mishnah and Tosephta will be found in H. Danby, *Tractate Sanhedrin* (S.P.C.K., 1919).

[2] Thus (e.g.) A. Taylor Innes, in *The Trial of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh, 1899), sums up his investigation of the Hebrew trial as follows: 'Our conclusion on the question of Hebrew law must be this: that a process begun, continued, and apparently finished, in the course of one night: commencing with witnesses against the accused who were sought for by the judges, but whose evidence was not sustained even by them; continued by interrogatories which Hebrew law does not sanction, and ending in a demand for confession which its doctors

It is a further grave question whether the Jewish Sanhedrin in the time of our Lord possessed, under Roman rule, any independent jurisdiction to try cases of crime of a serious kind at all. The Palestinian Talmud contains a statement to the effect that 'the Jews were deprived of the right of trying capital cases forty years before the destruction of the Temple'.[6] It is probable that 'forty years' is here a round number, and that the statement refers to a change in the status and powers of the Sanhedrin which should really be dated from A. D. 6, when Archelaus was deposed, and Judaea and Samaria were constituted a Roman province. It is to be inferred from a passage of Josephus that the High Priests henceforward had not even the right to assemble a Sanhedrin at all without the Procurator's express permission.[7] In harmony with this is

---

expressly forbid; all followed, twenty-four hours too soon, by a sentence which described a claim to be the Fulfiller of the hopes of Israel as blasphemy—that such a process had neither the form nor the fairness of a judicial trial' (*op. cit.*, pp. 58–59).

[1] i.e. the Pharisees as a whole, as distinct from certain extreme elements of the party.

[2] Josephus, *Antiq.* XX ix 1: cf. XIII x 6, 'The Pharisees . . . are not apt to be severe in punishments'.

[3] D. Chwolson, *Das letzte Passamahl Jesu*, pp. 118 sqq.

[4] The so-called 'Sanhedrin' which existed at Jabne after the fall of Jerusalem was a purely academic body which can never have exercised actual jurisdiction in criminal cases.

[5] H. Danby, *The Bearing of the Rabbinical Criminal Code on the Jewish Trial Narratives in the Gospels* (*J. T. S.* xxi 51 sqq.). I. Abrahams, in *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (ii 129 sqq.), criticizes certain of the conclusions drawn in Dr. Danby's article as being too sweeping, and is disposed to think that the tradition represented by the Mishnah had *some* historical value, but admits that the picture of the working of the Sanhedrin set forth in the Mishnaic writings is 'idealized in parts'.

[6] The reference is given as *Yer. Sanh.* 18 a, 24 b.

[7] Josephus, *Antiq.* XX ix 1. The reference in the context is to the assembly of a Sanhedrin for judicial purposes: no doubt for purposes other than strictly judicial the Sanhedrin may have been accorded a general permission to meet.

the evidence of the Fourth Gospel, in which at a certain stage in the proceedings Pilate is represented as offering to give such permission —*Take him yourselves, and judge him according to your law* (Jn xviii 31). It is implied, of course, that the Sanhedrin has not already done so: and in fact, as has been already remarked, the Fourth Gospel does not, strictly speaking, describe any regular trial before the Sanhedrin at all. What is described in Jn xviii 19 sqq. is of the nature of an informal investigation before the High Priest, and in xviii 31 the offer of Pilate is refused—*It is not lawful for us to put any man to death.* The natural inferences from the combined evidence of Josephus, the Talmud, and the Fourth Gospel are (1) that the Sanhedrin might have tried Jesus for a breach of Jewish law in a matter which did not involve an issue of life and death, *but only by permission of the Governor*, and (2) that on a capital charge they had no jurisdiction to try Him, *even with the Governor's consent.* The Roman *jus gladii*, or power of life and death, was vested in the Procurator, and in him alone, as the representative of Caesar, and he had no power to delegate it to the Sanhedrin. On the other hand, it is probable that the leaders of the Sanhedrin were entrusted with certain powers of initiative in criminal cases, including the right of arrest, the taking of evidence, and the conduct of a preliminary examination with a view to the preparation of the case for submission to the Roman Procurator for formal trial. The evidence of papyri found in the neighbouring province of Egypt shows that it would be in general harmony with the principles of Roman provincial administration to entrust to native officials such preparatory functions and powers of initiative, while reserving to the Roman magistrate the actual conduct of the trial; and the supposition is borne out, in the case of the trial of Jesus, by the evidence of the Gospels of Lk and Jn, which are here in conflict with those of Mt and Mk. On this view it is in strictness a mistake to speak of a *trial* of Jesus before the Sanhedrin (as distinct from what might be described as 'Grand Jury proceedings'): the real 'trial' was the trial before Pilate.[1] Our Lord was eventually put to death on the sentence of Pilate, presumably on the technical charge of *majestas* or treason against the Roman Imperial authority, a crime which might be regarded as being implicit in the claim of Messiahship, on the assumption that the Messiahship was to be interpreted in a political sense. The proceedings before the Sanhedrin were 'Grand Jury proceedings', directed towards the discovery and formulation of a charge which would lie in a Roman criminal court. For this purpose the purely religious charge of blasphemy against the Temple, which appeared at a certain stage to be on the point of being substantiated before the Sanhedrin, would be of little value to our Lord's enemies except as a subsidiary count in the indictment, and hence the extreme eagerness of the authorities to obtain an overt avowal of the Messianic claim from our Lord's own lips. It is probable that the terms of the actual indictment with which the Sanhedrin approached Pilate are more or less correctly formulated in Lk xxiii 2, though the charge there made of *forbidding to give tribute to Caesar* appears, in the light of Mk xii 13–17, a peculiarly shameless fabrication.

---

[1] The above view is substantially that of R. W. Husband in *The Prosecution of Jesus: its Date, History, and Legality* (Princeton, 1916), with whom Dr. Danby in the article already quoted agrees. For the contrary view that the Jews might have executed our Lord themselves, see S. Liberty, *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry*, pp. 141 sqq.

The impression that the proceedings before the Sanhedrin amounted, in the proper sense of the words, to a 'Jewish trial' is due primarily to Mk, who in the first place speaks of a full assembly of the Sanhedrin (verse 53; cf. viii 31, xi 27, xiv 43), and in the second place represents that assembly as having formally condemned our Lord and adjudged Him liable to death (verse 64). The probability is that Mk, who is no lawyer, has given the popular Christian version of what occurred, a version moreover which, however legally inaccurate, represents sufficiently the essential truth, viz. that the real cause of the death of Christ was the attitude of the leaders of the Jewish people, and that the charge upon which He was arraigned before Pilate was one which had first been trumped up for the purpose in the course of proceedings before the Sanhedrin. It was important, from the point of view of Christian propaganda in the Roman Empire, to establish the fact that Jesus, in spite of the fact that He had been condemned by the Roman Governor, was nevertheless innocent of any political offence, and that the primary responsibility for the judicial murder of which He was the victim rested with the Jews. Hence in the account of the examination before the Sanhedrin the emphasis is laid on the production of more or less captious charges of offences against the Jewish religious law, and on the confession by Jesus of the Messiahship in a wholly non-political sense; and in the account of the trial before Pilate on the reluctance of the Governor to pronounce sentence, and on the fact that he had perceived that *for envy the chief priests had delivered him up* (xv 10). Wellhausen is so impressed by the difference of atmosphere in the accounts of the two 'trials' that he is disposed to believe that the Jewish 'trial' was concerned wholly with the religious charge of blasphemy, based on the saying of Jesus about destroying the Temple,[1] and that the accusation of Messiahship only came in as a political charge before Pilate. This, however, is a mistake, and Wellhausen's proposal to regard verses 61 b–62 as an interpolation does utter violence to the text. On the other hand, it is to be remembered that none of our Lord's disciples was present at the hearing before the

---

[1] Cf. also discussions in Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, pp. 36 sqq.; Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 194 sqq.; E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge* i, pp. 188 sqq. The view that the real charge was that of blasphemy based on our Lord's attitude towards the Temple goes back to W. Brandt's *Evangelische Geschichte* (1893).

Sanhedrin (S. Peter was in the court-yard *beneath* with the palace servants, verse 66), and the Church must have been dependent on hearsay evidence for a knowledge of what happened. Some think that either Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathaea may have been present officially and may have subsequently divulged the proceedings, but this in the nature of things is at best a conjecture. ‘The plain sense of the Marcan account is: it was difficult to find a ground for condemnation. Even the charge of desiring to destroy the Temple could not be established or proved beyond cavil. Eventually it was necessary to raise the question of the Messiahship. When Jesus admitted this, He was condemned to death for blasphemy’ (J. Weiss).

53. Jesus is taken to the High Priest's palace, which was not the usual place of assembly of the Sanhedrin. They seem, however, on this occasion to have held an extraordinary meeting there. On the probability that the meeting was not actually held until the morning, and that Mk has to some extent misconceived its character, see above.

54. If Peter was really the person who wounded the High Priest's slave in the Garden of Gethsemane (so Jn xviii 10), his boldness in following the party and penetrating into the courtyard of the palace is extraordinary. According to Jn xviii 16 he was introduced into the courtyard by *another disciple* who was known unto the High Priest. The *officers* (or ‘attendants’) are not necessarily those who had taken part in the arrest. *In the light of the fire*: the last three words do not represent anything which appears in the Greek. The word *light* here stands for ‘fire’, as in the Greek of 1 Macc xii 29.

56. According to the principles of Jewish jurisprudence the evidence of the witnesses must accord absolutely. It is probable that they were introduced one by one into the assembly (cf. *History of Susanna* 51–61). Mk makes the point that the evidence of the witnesses against Jesus was discordant and perjured.

58. Mt xxvi 60 does not describe the witnesses who made this assertion as ‘false’. For the requirement of at least two accordant witnesses satisfactorily to establish a charge cf. Num xxxv 30, Dt xvii 6, xix 15. It is probable that our Lord had actually uttered some such saying as is here alleged: cf. xv 29, Acts vi 13, Jn ii 19; also Mk xiii 2 and the reading of D and Old Lat. to which reference is made in the notes *ad loc.* The saying is variously interpreted, and in its original form was probably eschatological, i. e. it may have referred to the new supernatural Age, in which the ‘sanctuary of this world’ (cf. Heb ix 1) would be replaced by a new supernatural temple *not made with hands* (cf. Dan. ii 34, 2 Cor v 1, Heb. ix 24, and for *houses made with hands*, Acts vii 48). For the eschatological hope of a new and more glorious Temple see references in Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums* (2nd edn.), pp. 273–274. D and Old Lat. here read *I will raise up* instead of *I will build*, suggesting an allegorical reference to the Resurrection (cf. Jn ii 21). J. Weiss thinks *in three days* should be rendered ‘after three days’, i. e. not ‘in the course of three days’ but ‘after a short interval’.

61 a. For the silence of Jesus cf. xv 5. The Christian tradition had no report of any reply made to these charges. Apart from this, the silent dignity of the Accused in face of His voluble accusers serves to heighten the impression of Messianic majesty. Cf. also Is liii 7.

61 b. That Jesus was challenged to say whether He claimed to be the Messiah, and that He admitted the claim, may be taken as a solid *datum* of the tradition. It is possible that the actual wording both of the High Priest's question and of the reply of our Lord may have been modified by Christian ideas. *The Blessed* is of course merely a Jewish reverential circumlocution to avoid speaking directly of God. But *Son of God* does not seem to have been in Judaism a widely recognized title of the Messiah, though of course it could be based on Pss ii 7, lxxxix 26, 27.

62. Mk represents our Lord as acknowledging His Messiahship[1] in the same terms as those in which the earliest Church confesses it, i. e. He is the Son of Man, who is shortly to appear in glory, to the confusion of those who condemned Him. *The right hand of power* = 'the right hand of God' (cf. Dalman, *Words of Jesus* [E.T.], p. 200). The saying as a whole combines Dan vii 13 with Ps cx 1.

63. For the rending of the clothes as a sign of extreme grief or of horror cf. Gen. xxxvii 29, Judith xiv 19, Acts xiv 14, Josephus, *De Bell. Jud.* ii xv 4.

64. It has been argued that a claim to be the Messiah could not of itself amount to blasphemy, which, as defined strictly, according to Lev xxiv 10–23, must involve an overt and definite reviling of the Divine Name. It is maintained, for example, by Loisy, that only from the point of view of a Christian theology which interpreted the title 'Son of God' in a more or less metaphysical sense, and set the Messiah on an equality with God, could it be imagined that a Jew would regard such a claim as being intrinsically blasphemous (cf. Jn x 33 sqq.). Wellhausen believes that the charge of blasphemy was based rather upon our Lord's saying about the Temple than upon the overt claim to be Son of God, since to attack the Temple was to attack God's House (see notes on xiii 1–2 *supra*). Some writers speak in this connexion of a charge of 'constructive blasphemy'. It is clear from Mk ii 7, iii 28, 29 that the term 'blasphemy' was commonly used in a wider sense than that which is implied by the strict letter of the law in Leviticus. Cf. also Strack and Billerbeck i, pp. 1008 sqq. The penalty enjoined in Lev xxiv 16 for blasphemy was that of death by stoning. The Jews, however, under Roman rule were not in a position to carry out such a penalty, even

---

[1] B. H. Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, p. 322) is inclined to accept the reading of a group of MSS. which he thinks represent the early text current in the Church of Caesarea, and which for *I am* read *Thou sayest that I am*: cf. xv 2. If so, the Lord neither affirms nor denies the Messiahship as formulated by the High Priest, but asserts it in terms of the faith of the earliest Church.

supposing they imagined our Lord to have incurred it, least of all at the time of the Passover, when the Governor was personally resident in the city. On the probability that Mk is mistaken in thinking at all of a formal death sentence by the Sanhedrin, see above.

65. Taken strictly in its context, this verse would imply that those who insulted our Lord in the first instance were the actual members of the Sanhedrin. There are some critics who believe that Mk means this, but it is more probable that the grammar is careless, and that we are to understand a change of subject at the beginning of the verse. Cf. Lk xxii 63, where, however, the ambiguity is carefully removed. The insults are in part such as are described in Is l 6. The covering of the face, followed by blows and the mocking demand 'Prophesy', appears to require for its explanation the additional words in Mt and Lk.—*Prophesy: who is he that struck thee?* (Lk xxii 64; cf. Mt xxvi 68). There is, however, good MS. authority for the omission of the words *and to cover his face* from the text of Mk. Without them the meaning is perhaps 'We will teach you to utter prophecies!' The last words of the verse should perhaps be translated 'And the attendants took Him into custody with blows'. The phrase, however, is a strange one, and the meaning not quite certain: see R.V. mg.

66–72. *S. Peter's Denials*

(Cf. Mt xxvi 69–75; Lk xxii 56–62)

66 And as Peter was beneath in the court, there cometh one of
67 the maids of the high priest; and seeing Peter warming
himself, she looked upon him, and saith, Thou also wast with
68 the Nazarene, *even* Jesus. But he denied, saying, I neither
know, nor understand what thou sayest:[1] and he went out
69 into the porch;[2] and the cock crew.[3] And the maid saw
him, and began again to say to them that stood by, This is
70 *one* of them. But he again denied it. And after a little
while again they that stood by said to Peter, Of a truth
71 thou art *one* of them; for thou art a Galilaean. But he
began to curse, and to swear, I know not this man of whom
72 ye speak. And straightway the second time the cock crew.
And Peter called to mind the word, how that Jesus said
unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me
thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept.[4]

---

[1] Or, *I neither know, nor understand: thou, what sayest thou?*

[2] Gr. *forecourt.*

[3] Many ancient authorities omit *and the cock crew.*

[4] Or, *And he began to weep.*

The story of what happened to Peter in the courtyard of the High Priest's palace, for which verse 54 *supra* has served to prepare the way, rests no doubt ultimately on S. Peter's own subsequent account of it. It is told with extraordinary vividness. The slave girl recognizes Peter in the moonlight as one whom she has previously seen in the company of Jesus, and Peter in terror denies. The girl's words should be translated with Menzies, 'You too were with the Nazarene, with Jesus', and S. Peter's reply either 'I neither know nor understand what you mean' or 'I neither know nor understand. What do you mean?' His prudential withdrawal into the *forecourt* or *porch* (in a Graeco-Roman house one would think of the *vestibulum* between the *atrium* and the street) does not prove to be the end of his difficulties, since the girl follows him (Mt xxvi 71 thinks of *another* slave girl) and draws the attention of the bystanders. Peter denies again, but is recognized as *a Galilaean* (a gloss found in some MSS. here, based probably on Mt xxvi 73, suggests that he was recognized as coming from Galilee by his dialect). This leads to a more heated denial, with cursing and oaths. (The meaning of *to curse* is probably to invoke curses upon oneself if one is not speaking the truth.) The 'second cock-crow' which follows may be a simple mark of time, or it may be a misunderstanding of a tradition that the Roman signal known as *gallicinium* sounded just then from the Castle (see notes on xiv 30): but it seems that Mk thought of a literal bird, and if the words *and the cock crew* in verse 68 are genuine, it was the second that Peter had heard. If the words in question were not in the original text of Mk (they are omitted by B and other authorities), the meaning may be that this cock-crow was the first that Peter had actually heard, but on the strength of the prophecy in xiv 30 it was inferred that a previous crowing must have occurred without being noticed. Neither Mt nor Lk mentions more than one cock-crowing, and they introduce it at this point into the narrative. The omission of the words *the second time* from the text of Mk xiv 72 in ℵ and a few other MSS. is probably either accidental or due to deliberate assimilation to Mt and Lk. Peter at this point recalls the prophecy of Jesus. The last words are difficult in the Greek, and are variously translated: either 'when he realized' or 'when it occurred to him', *he wept*, or 'he began to weep' or 'he wept bitterly' have been proposed. Swete inclines to the rendering 'and he answered by weeping'. Moulton and Milligan, referring to a papyrus in which the participle which causes the difficulty is used, would translate 'and he set to and wept'. On the whole, the most attractive view is that the word in question means 'having drawn on his cloak', i. e. having drawn it over his head or face, *sc.* 'he covered his face, and wept' (so Pallis: but the interpretation goes back to Theophylact, Archbishop of Ochrida about 1077, who wrote an exposition of the four Gospels in Greek).

CHAPTER XV

1–5. *Jesus before Pilate*

(Cf. Mt. xxvii 1–2, 11–14; Lk. xxii 66, xxiii 1–5)

1 And straightway in the morning the chief priests with the
elders and scribes, and the whole council, held a consultation,
and bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him
2 up to Pilate. And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King
of the Jews? And he answering saith unto him, Thou
3 sayest. And the chief priests accused him of many things.
4 And Pilate again asked him, saying, Answerest thou
nothing? behold how many things they accuse thee of.
5 But Jesus no more answered anything; insomuch that
Pilate marvelled.

On the Marcan duplication of the meeting of the Sanhedrin, and on the probability that any formal meeting of that body which was held would take place in the morning rather than at night (cf. Lk xxii 66), see the notes on xiv 53–65 *supra*. Mk seems to have been aware that the Sanhedrin met in the early morning, but he thinks of the meeting in question as having taken the form simply of a hasty consultation ratifying the decision already taken. *The chief priests with the elders and scribes* together make up *the whole council*: the grammar of the sentence is awkward, but Mk wishes to emphasize as strongly as possible the formal responsibility of the Jewish authorities as a whole for what took place. Conversely, the responsibility of Pilate is as far as possible minimized, and stress is laid in the sequel on his reluctance to condemn the Prisoner, and his desire to find a pretext for setting Him free. Mk does not tell his readers who Pilate is (contrast Mt xxvii 2), or why he happened to be in Jerusalem at this juncture. It is presupposed that the story is familiar to all Christians, and that the necessary explanations may be taken for granted.

1. *Held a consultation.* The Greek is ambiguous, since the word rendered *consultation* may mean either 'council' or 'counsel'. In Mk iii 6 it has the latter meaning, and so probably here—'they took counsel'. A variant reading which has considerable MS. support would yield the meaning 'they prepared their decision'.

Pilate. Pontius Pilate, the fifth in succession of the Roman Procurators of Judaea, held office from A. D. 26–36, and, according to Philo (*Leg. ad Caium* 38), was described by Agrippa I in a letter to

Caligula as 'inflexible, merciless, and obstinate', and as having been guilty of 'corruption, violence, robbery, ill-usage, oppression, illegal executions, and never-ending most grievous cruelty'. Lk xiii 1 alludes to an outrage perpetrated by Pilate, but apart from this one reference the Gospels represent his character in a not unfavourable light, at least by contrast with that of the Jewish hierarchy, to whose insistent demands for the condemnation of Jesus he eventually yields. It is probable that something must be allowed both for rhetorical overstatement in the Jewish denunciations of Pilate's character, and also for the operation in the evangelical tradition of an apologetic tendency to exonerate the Procurator. It was important for political reasons to establish the point that Pilate really considered the Prisoner to be innocent. The Governor resided normally at Caesarea, but at Passover time came up to Jerusalem to keep order. He was therefore in residence at the time of the Crucifixion, either in Herod's Palace, or (as some authorities think) at the Castle Antonia, on the north side of the Temple.

2. Pilate's question is no doubt based on the charge of Messiahship in the political sense, officially alleged against the Prisoner by the Sanhedrin. There is possibly a contemptuous emphasis upon the pronoun, *sc.* 'Art *thou* the King of the Jews?'

Thou sayest: cf. Mt xxvi 25, 64, xxvii 11, Lk xxii 70, Jn xviii 37. The attempts to explain these passages as reflecting in various forms a recognized Jewish formula of assent (*sc.* 'Thou art right') appear unsuccessful: cf. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* ii, pp. 1–3. The meaning probably is 'The assertion is yours. I neither affirm nor deny it.'

3. In view of our Lord's ambiguous answer the priests reiterate with vehemence their accusations.

5. For our Lord's silence cf. xiv 61.

6–15. *The Choice of Barabbas*

(Cf. Mt xxvii 15–26; Lk xxiii 18–25)

6 Now at the feast[1] he used to release unto them one
7 prisoner, whom they asked of him. And there was one
called Barabbas, *lying* bound with them that had made
insurrection, men who in the insurrection had committed
8 murder. And the multitude went up and began to ask him
9 *to do* as he was wont to do unto them. And Pilate answered
them, saying, Will ye that I release unto you the King of
10 the Jews? For he perceived that for envy the chief priests

---

[1] Or, *a feast.*

11 had delivered him up. But the chief priests stirred up the
multitude, that he should rather release Barabbas unto
12 them. And Pilate again answered and said unto them,
What then shall I do unto him whom ye call the King
13 of the Jews? And they cried out again, Crucify him.
14 And Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done?
15 But they cried out exceedingly, Crucify him. And Pilate,
wishing to content the multitude, released unto them
Barabbas, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged him
to be crucified.

Apart from the evidence of the Gospels, nothing is known of the custom of releasing a prisoner in connexion with the Passover. Livy v 13 is quoted for the release of prisoners at the Lectisternium at Rome, and Deissmann refers to a papyrus of the first century A. D. in which a certain Phibion is released by the Prefect, G. Septimius Vegetus, apparently in deference to a popular demand.[1] Mk's language in verse 6 does not suggest more than that it was a custom observed by Pilate: it does not follow that previous Procurators had done so. Lk's account, if Lk xxiii 17 is to be omitted (and there is strong MS. evidence for the omission), contains no reference to any such regular custom, though duly chronicling the demand of the people that Barabbas should be released instead of Jesus. It is not impossible that the statement that there was a recognized custom of releasing a prisoner in connexion with the Passover may be an erroneous inference on the part of the Evangelists from the present episode. How then is the Barabbas episode to be explained? I suggest that it arose as the result of a strangely dramatic historical coincidence. It is pointed out by E. Meyer that the *multitude* who *went up* to interview Pilate about the release of a prisoner (verse 8) are not to be understood as having assembled in order to witness the trial of Jesus: they are a crowd of partisans of Barabbas, who happened to arrive at this point in the proceedings, presumably in order to beg for the latter's release.[2] This view explains what is often felt as a difficulty, viz. the sudden change of attitude on the part of the crowd, more especially on the assumption (often gratuitously made) that it was the same crowd who on Palm Sunday had hailed our Lord as King. There was in fact no change of attitude, since there is no reason to assume that the crowd of Mk xv 8 was at any time sympathetic towards our Lord. It is, further, worthy of note that in the early 'Caesarean' text of Mt xxvii 16, 17 the name

---

[1] The Prefect, according to the papyrus report of the case, addressed the prisoner with the words 'Thou hadst been worthy of scourging . . . but I will give thee to the people'. (Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* [E.T.], p. 267).

[2] E. Meyer, *Ursprung u. Anfänge* i, p. 195.

'Barabbas' is twice given as '*Jesus* Barabbas', and although A. C. Clark thinks that the reading in question is a blunder due to dittography,[1] it is accepted as genuine by Burkitt, Allen, Streeter, and other authorities, and is probably correct. It is intelligible that early Christian sentiment should have shown itself in general reluctant to recognize that the name 'Jesus' was actually borne by the evil-doer Barabbas, but the compiler of Mt depended at this point probably upon good tradition. The name 'Jesus' (= Joshua) was by no means uncommon among the Jews (cf. Col iv 11), and it is not improbable that the coincidence of the names may afford a clue to the understanding of what actually occurred, viz. that the arrival of a crowd demanding the release of 'Jesus' (i.e. Jesus Barabbas) was at first mistaken by Pilate for a demonstration of popular sympathy in favour of *Jesus of Nazareth*, of whose harmlessness from the political point of view he was personally satisfied, and whom he at once offers to set free. *The chief priests*, however, *stirred up the multitude, that he should rather release Barabbas unto them*: in other words, the chief priests intervened by making common cause with Barabbas's supporters and themselves championing the latter's release, in return for the support of the 'Barabbas' party in favour of their own demand for the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth.

7. A literal translation of this verse would be 'And there was the person called Barabbas in prison with the insurgents, those who in the insurrection had committed murder.' The 'insurrection' was probably not of a very serious kind from the political point of view: the language of Mk would be fully satisfied by a quasi-political riot involving bloodshed. Menzies is probably wrong in suggesting that Barabbas had not been himself seriously implicated, but had merely been accidentally connected with the rioters. It is much more likely that he was a popular leader. Mk takes it for granted that his readers know who 'the person called Barabbas' was, and also about 'the' riot and 'the' rioters. The phrase 'the person called Barabbas' suggests that Mk knew that Barabbas was not his primary name: it may be that he knew that the full name was *Jesus* Barabbas, but preferred not to write the name in full. McNeile, on Mt xxvii 16, suggests that the name 'Jesus' may have dropped out of the text, and that Mk originally wrote 'Jesus who was called Barabbas'. S. Jerome asserts that in the Gospel according to the Hebrews the word Barabbas is rendered 'Son of their Master', which points either to a form Bar-rabban (= 'Son of a Rabbi') or to Bar-Abba (= Son of the Father' in the sense of 'Son of the teacher'). Brandt, on the strength of this, elaborates a theory that Barabbas was the son of a learned man who had got into trouble with the authorities, and that the people intervened on his behalf out of respect for his father. But this is the mere spinning of hypotheses, and it is more

---

[1] A. C. Clark, *The Primitive Text of the Acts and Gospels*, p. 41.

likely that Barabbas means simply 'Son of Abba'—a quite common Jewish name.

15. *To content the multitude*: The phrase in the Greek is an attempt to translate the Latin *satisfacere*: there are parallels elsewhere in the Greek of this period. The terrible *scourging* is mentioned very baldly, being represented by one word only in the Greek. It was the normal prelude to crucifixion (cf. Josephus, *De Bell. Jud.* II xiv 9, V xi 1). In Lk it is not said that our Lord was scourged, though in Lk xxiii 16, 22 scourging is suggested by Pilate as an alternative punishment instead of crucifixion. In Jn xix 1 sqq. the scourging and the mockery by the soldiers take place at an earlier stage of the proceedings, i. e. *before* the final condemnation of Jesus to death.

16–20. *The Mockery by the Soldiers*

(Cf. Mt xxvii 27–31)

16 And the soldiers led him away within the court, which is
the Praetorium:[1] and they call together the whole band.[2]
17 And they clothe him with purple, and plaiting a crown of
18 thorns, they put it on him; and they began to salute him,
19 Hail, King of the Jews! And they smote his head with
a reed, and did spit upon him, and bowing their knees
20 worshipped him. And when they had mocked him, they
took off from him the purple, and put on him his garments.
And they lead him out to crucify him.

[1] Or, *palace*. [2] Or, *cohort*.

Lk omits this episode, perhaps regarding it as a doublet of the story—peculiar to the tradition which he primarily followed for the Passion narrative—of the mockery by Herod and his soldiers (Lk xxiii 11). A passage from Philo (*In Flaccum* 5–6) describes how the populace of Alexandria, in order to ridicule the newly made King Agrippa, who had received the crown of Judaea from Caligula and was passing through Egypt on his way back from Rome, dressed up 'as in theatrical mimes' a lunatic named Carabas and treated him as a mock-king. The elaborate theories which have been based upon this passage by S. Reinach[1] and J. G. Frazer,[2] who think that Carabas should be emended into Barabbas, and that the latter is really the name, not of an historical individual, but of a character in some kind of ritual drama analogous to the rites enacted at the Roman Saturnalia or the Babylonian festival of the Sacaea, have been taken more seriously than they deserve by Loisy, who speaks of our Lord as having been crucified 'in the character of a Barabbas'.[1] Lagrange justly points out that there is no suggestion at all in Philo (who was an eyewitness of the scene described) that the Alexandrian mob was carrying out an accustomed ritual: they were merely ridiculing King Agrippa, and the story does really illustrate the Gospel episode of the mockery by the soldiers, 'since it shows us with what zest the Graeco-Roman world was ready to make sport of the regal pretensions of a Jew'.[2] Others have suggested that there may have been some kind of popular mime or play, *The King with the Crown of Thorns*,[3] and that the soldiers may have conceived the idea of treating our Lord in mockery as the hero of it. Such a theory is no doubt possible, but it remains a mere conjecture. The story in the Gospel is quite straightforward, and is fully intelligible as it stands. As Moffatt remarks, 'the mock homage . . . may have been determined by some hazy notion of imitating a pagan bit of ritual', but no such hypothesis is required in order to explain what was really no more than a piece of rough 'military horse-play'.[4]

---

[1] S. Reinach, *Orpheus* [E.T.], pp. 229–230.
[2] J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, 3rd ed.; Part VI, pp. 412 sqq.

16. *The court, which is the Praetorium.* The word *praetorium*, which originally meant 'the general's tent', 'the head-quarters in a camp', came in later usage to mean 'a palace', 'the residence of a governor or prince' (see Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 99). Moulton and Milligan produce evidence which goes to show that the Greek word rendered *court* (= originally 'a courtyard') could also be used in the sense of 'a palace'.[5] Mk's Roman readers will therefore have understood the whole phrase as meaning 'the palace, i. e. the barracks', since the word *praetorium* no doubt still carried with it something of its military associations. We must assume that the proceedings hitherto had taken place outside the palace. Opinion is divided as to whether the palace in question was Herod's palace or the fortress Antonia. If it was really the military head-quarters, the latter is probably meant: and if Herod was in Jerusalem at this time (Lk xxiii 7 sqq.), it seems likely that he occupied the former. It is known that the Roman procurators occasionally occupied Herod's palace (Josephus, *De Bell. Jud.* II xiv 8), but Pilate may on this occasion have waived his right in Herod's favour, and taken up his own quarters in Antonia, where the troops were stationed.[6]

The whole band. The word strictly means a *cohort* (R.V. mg.), a body of troops several hundreds strong. It is not necessary here to take it *au pied de la lettre.*

---

[1] Loisy, *Les Evangiles Synoptiques* ii, pp. 653–654.

[2] Lagrange, *ad loc.*

[3] Reich, *Der König mit der Dornenkrone* (1905), to whom Moffatt refers.

[4] Moffatt, art. 'Trial of Jesus', in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.*

[5] Moulton and Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* i, p. 92.

[6] Sanday, however, following Kreyenbühl, argues in favour of Herod's palace as the scene of the trial and condemnation of Jesus (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, pp. 52 sqq.)

17. *Purple.* A soldier's *paludamentum* or *sagum*, i.e. a scarlet military cloak, probably did duty for the 'purple' of royalty. *A crown of thorns*: a roughly plaited wreath of some thorny plant to represent the *Imperator's* laurel wreath.

18. *Hail, King of the Jews*, i.e. *Ave, rex Judaeorum*, a parody of *Ave, Caesar Imperator.*

19. Mt xxvii 29 makes them first force our Lord to hold the reed as a mock sceptre before seizing it themselves and striking Him with it.

Worshipped him. The meaning of course is that they paid Him mock homage as a king, not that they worshipped Him as a god.

20. The brief scene lasted no doubt only until the preparations were complete for the Crucifixion. Our Lord would then be led out under the escort of a centurion in command of a *quaternion*, or detachment of four soldiers.

21–32. *The Crucifixion*

(Cf. Mt xxvii 32–44; Lk xxiii 26, 33–43)

21 And they compel[1] one passing by, Simon of Cyrene,
coming from the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus,
22 to go *with them*, that he might bear his cross. And they
bring him unto the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted,
23 The place of a skull. And they offered him wine
24 mingled with myrrh: but he received it not. And they
crucify him, and part his garments among them, casting
25 lots upon them, what each should take. And it was the
26 third hour, and they crucified him. And the superscription
of his accusation was written over, THE KING OF THE JEWS.
27 And with him they crucify two robbers; one on his
29 right hand, and one on his left.[2] And they that passed
by railed on him, wagging their heads, and saying,
Ha! thou that destroyest the temple,[3] and buildest it in
30 three days, save thyself, and come down from the cross.
31 In like manner also the chief priests mocking *him* among
themselves with the scribes said, He saved others; himself[4]

---

[1] Gr. *impress.*

[2] Many ancient authorities insert verse 28 *And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was reckoned with transgressors.* See Lk xxii 37.

[3] Or, *sanctuary.*

[4] Or, *can he not save himself?*

32 he cannot save. Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross, that we may see and believe. And they that were crucified with him reproached him.

21. It was customary to compel a person who had been sentenced to death by crucifixion to carry his own cross (i. e. not the upright stake, but the cross-piece or *patibulum*) to the place of execution (cf. *H. D. B.* s. v. *Cross*). Cf. Jn xix 17, which at this point appears to contradict directly the Synoptic tradition. According to Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* I xxiv 4) it was maintained by the Gnostic Basilides that Jesus and Simon of Cyrene had changed places, and that the latter was really crucified instead of the former. If such a theory was already current in Gnostic circles at Ephesus when the Fourth Gospel was written, the omission of all reference to Simon of Cyrene in that Gospel may well have been deliberate. The traditional reconciliation of the two traditions by means of the assumption that our Lord Himself carried the cross until He was exhausted by its weight, and that He was then relieved by Simon, is intrinsically quite probable, more especially as the interposition of the latter appears to be virtually guaranteed by Mk's allusion to his sons, who must be supposed to have been alive and well known in the Church when the Gospel was written.

The word *compel* or *impress* (R.V. mg.) which occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Mt v 41, xxvii 32, is derived from the Persian, but had become current in popular Greek (cf. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, E.T., p. 87). *Simon*, of whom nothing is known apart from this reference, was probably a Jewish pilgrim from Cyrene, who happened to be entering the city at this precise moment from his lodging in *the country* (i. e. outside the walls)—a more probable view than that which assumes that he had migrated back from Cyrene to Palestine and was now settled in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. The phrase *from the country* does not necessarily mean 'from his farm', still less 'from work in the fields', and consequently throws no light on the question whether the Crucifixion took place on the 'Preparation of the Passover' (Jn xix 14) or on the actual Passover Day (when work in the fields would be contrary to the Law). For Jews of Cyrene cf. Acts ii 10, vi 9, xiii 1: the Jewish settlements there are said to have dated from the time of King Ptolemy I of Egypt. *Alexander and Rufus* are clearly persons well known to the Roman Church, and probably members of it. The name Alexander was common, and Alexander the son of Simon should not be identified with the Alexander of Acts xix 33 or of 1 Tim i 20, 2 Tim iv 14. For the identification of *Rufus* with the Rufus of Rom xvi 13 there is more to be said.

22. The traditional site of *Golgotha* (a strict transliteration of the Aramaic would yield the form *Golgoltha*) is now included within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the site of which appears in New

Testament times to have been outside the city walls (cf. Heb xiii 12). The tradition (which can be traced back to the time of Constantine) may be wrong, but more modern guesses are not likely to be right: cf. Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, pp. 67 sqq. It is not certain that the 'skull-place' was a hill, and there is no evidence as to how it acquired its peculiar name. The form *Calvary* is derived from the Vulgate rendering *Calvariae locus*. S. Jerome on Mt xxvii 33 refers to a tradition according to which the skull of Adam was buried there, remarking that it was 'an attractive explanation (i. e. of the name), and one calculated to tickle the ears of the people, but not, however, true'. Mk translates the Aramaic word according to his custom. It is probable that the locality was just beyond one of the city gates, and close to a public road. 'Crucifixion, like gibbeting, was meant to terrify, and a public place was chosen for it' (Menzies).

23. Theophrastus and Pliny refer to the custom of mingling wine with myrrh. The phrase does not therefore of itself indicate that the wine was drugged. A passage in the Talmud refers to a Jewish custom (based on Prov xxxi 6–7) according to which a cup of wine mixed with frankincense was given to those condemned to death with the idea of alleviating their sufferings, a charitable office which appears to have been undertaken by the women of Jerusalem. It does not appear to have been a Roman custom. Those, therefore, who offered the cup to Jesus will have been friends. He refuses it, not wishing to have His senses dulled. The *gall* of Mt xxvii 34 is due to the influence of Ps lxix 21.

24. Crucifixion commonly involved the nailing of the hands to the cross-piece fixed to the upright stake. A wooden support was provided for the body. It is doubtful whether the feet were also nailed (cf. Jn xx 20, 25; Lk xxiv 39–40 is possibly influenced by Ps xxii 16). The garments of the condemned (who was crucified naked), became the perquisites of his executioners. The casting of lots for shares is quite probable (according to Jn xix 23 sqq. only for the tunic), and need not be a mere inference from Ps xxii 18. It was the soldiers' duty to remain on guard by the crosses until death ensued, in order to prevent a rescue, and they may have brought dice with them to while away the time.

25. A variant reading found in D and Old Lat., which would give the sense 'it was the third hour, and they were guarding him' (of which Mt xxvii 36 might be regarded as a paraphrase), is preferred by some scholars. The ordinary text must be regarded as an example of Semitic parataxis, and means 'it was the third hour when they crucified him'. The datum of time here cannot be reconciled with that of Jn xix 14, though the attempt has been made by resort to various expedients. But ancient notes of time were very vague—it is only since the invention of watches that men have ceased to tell the time by guesswork—and Mk is following a scheme by which he divided the day of the Crucifixion somewhat artificially into three-hour periods (cf. xv 1, where *in the morning* probably

means six a.m., xv 33, 34 for the *sixth* and *ninth* hours—i.e. twelve noon and three p.m.—and xv 42 where *even* = six p.m. The time meant in the present passage is nine a.m.).

26. It was customary for an inscribed *titulus*, or tablet setting forth the grounds of condemnation, to be carried in front of the condemned person, or tied round his neck, and eventually affixed to his cross. According to Jn xix 20 the *titulus* in the case of our Lord was trilingual. The Evangelists vary as to the precise wording, but agree as to the main point, viz. that our Lord was crucified as *King of the Jews*, i. e. on the ground of His Messianic pretensions. B. W. Bacon points out that the assertion that the Crucified Messiah is none the less *King of the Jews* is five times reiterated in this chapter (verses 2, 9, 12, 18, 26).

27. There is nothing to suggest that it was with the intention of insulting Jesus that the two *robbers* (i. e. 'bandits', rather than ordinary 'thieves') were crucified with Him. It is possible that they may have been concerned in the same affair as Barabbas, and their execution may have been fixed for the day in question, or they may have been condemned, earlier than our Lord, on the same morning. Nevertheless the mind of early Christianity saw in what was done a fulfilment of Scripture, and many MSS. here add verse 28—a reference to Is liii 12—which appears, however, not to be genuine in the text of Mk, but to be derived from Lk xxii 37.

29–32. The mocking taunts of those who passed by and of the chief priests respectively recall the two charges (blasphemy against the Temple and the claim to the Messiahship) which had been brought against our Lord at the examination before the Sanhedrin. The description is perhaps coloured by Lam ii 15, Ps xxii 7–8. 'The things said are such as the early Christians must often have heard in the controversy they carried on with the Jews' (Menzies). But the scene has verisimilitude, and there is a nice psychological discrimination made between the taunts of the vulgar, who address our Lord directly, and the derisive comments of the members of the Sanhedrin, who converse with one another. *And they that were crucified with him reproached him*: Lk alone discriminates between the respective attitudes of the two *robbers* (Lk xxiii 39 sqq.). Tradition gives names to them—in the *Acts of Pilate*, Dysmas and Gestas: in the Arabic *Gospel of the Infancy*, Titus and Dumachus: in one Old Latin MS. of Mk, Zoathas and Chammas.

33–39. *Jesus dies*

(Cf. Mt xxvii 45–54; Lk xxiii 44–47)

33 And when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness
34 over the whole land[1] until the ninth hour. And at the

---

[1] Or, *earth*.

ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God,
35 why hast thou forsaken me?[1] And some of them that stood by, when they heard it, said, Behold, he calleth Elijah.
36 And one ran, and filling a sponge full of vinegar, put it on a reed, and gave him to drink, saying, Let be; let us see
37 whether Elijah cometh to take him down. And Jesus
38 uttered a loud voice, and gave up the ghost. And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom.
39 And when the centurion, which stood by over against him, saw that he so gave up the ghost,[2] he said, Truly this man was the Son of God.[3]

[1] Or, *why didst thou forsake me?*
[2] Many ancient authorities read *so cried out, and gave up the ghost.*
[3] Or, *a son of God.*

33. The *darkness* is to be understood as having been *over the whole land*, not (as in R.V. mg.) over the whole *earth*: cf. Ex x 22. Loisy remarks: 'It is a question of a moral impression, not of a physical miracle, a symbolic trait and not an obscuration of the atmosphere. Many commentators have said, with Origen, that the sky had become covered with heavy clouds. The sky is always sombre for a soul in desolation. It matters little whether there are literal clouds or not. . . . The traditional datum here floats, as it were, between the real and the ideal. It is adequately traced to its historical origin, if we say that it represents a sentiment, or an idea.' Lagrange thinks of a 'black sirocco', such as is not uncommon in Jerusalem in early April, though of a 'miraculous intensity'. Lk xxiii 45 appears to contemplate an eclipse of the sun, but this, as Origen already observed, would be impossible at the time of the Paschal full moon. It seems on the whole probable that the tendency to associate symbolic portents with the story of the Passion (which in Mt is carried further, and gives rise to the episodes of the earthquake and the resurrection of the bodies of departed Jewish saints—Mt xxvii 51–53) is already operative in Mk, and that both the supernatural darkness and the rending of the Temple Veil (verse 38) should be so explained. The commentators compare Vergil, *Georg.* I, 463 sqq.

Solem quis dicere falsum
Audeat? . . .
Ille etiam exstincto miseratus Caesare Romam
Cum caput obscura nitidum ferrugine texit
Impiaque aeternam timuerunt saecula noctem;

and from the Old Testament such passages as Is xiii 10, l 3, Jer xv 9, and especially Amos viii 9. Mk thinks of the supernatural darkness as having lasted for three hours.

34. This verse is classed by Schmiedel among the 'foundation pillars' of a truly scientific life of Jesus, as being wholly beyond the reach of invention in the Christian tradition—presumably on the assumption that it is to be interpreted as an utterance of despair.[1] It is possibly because it was capable of being so interpreted that it was omitted by Lk, and softened, in texts current in Italy, Gaul, and Carthage (Dcik), by the substitution of 'Why didst thou reproach me?' (i.e. 'Why didst thou give me over to reproach?') for *Why didst thou forsake me?* But it cannot have been so understood by Mk, otherwise it would certainly not have found a place in the Gospel text. A number of modern scholars, disagreeing with Schmiedel's argument, believe that the earliest tradition knew only that Jesus died with a loud cry, and that the words here ascribed to Him are due to the influence of Ps xxii. So (e. g.) Loisy: 'Ps xxii dominates all the accounts of the Passion. Nothing more natural than to place its opening words in the mouth of the dying Christ.' Similarly J. Weiss: 'The Evangelist did not concern himself with the deeper meaning of the words. He simply regarded them as the fulfilment of a prophecy derived from a Messianic Psalm. . . . In days before any Christian Gospels existed, the sufferings of the Messiah were so often presented to the Church by means of the reading aloud of this Psalm, that details derived from it became incorporated as integral elements in the story of the Passion.' It has, of course, often been argued that our Lord during the agony of the Passion may have stayed His soul by the repetition of passages from the Psalter, and that Ps xxii may have been running in His thoughts. The Psalm as a whole is not one of despair: it is the Psalm of a righteous sufferer who yet is confident of the love and the protection of the God of all holiness, even unto death. 'He who quotes the first words of a poem may be thinking not of those words only but of some later part of the poem or of its general course of thought' (Menzies). Nevertheless, it may be doubted whether B. Weiss is not right in saying that an interpretation introduces 'an artificial element of reflection' into 'a moment of immediate feeling'; and on the assumption that our Lord really uttered the words it is better to say frankly that we do not know exactly what was in His mind at the time, that we are here face to face with the supreme mystery of the Saviour's Passion. Perhaps the best comment is that of T. R. Glover (quoted by H. G. Wood *ad loc.*): 'Strange to think that is the cry of the feeling of Jesus. One is almost tempted to say that there, as in a supreme instance, is measured the distance between feeling and fact. So He felt; and yet mankind has been of another mind, that there, more than in all else that He was or did, there was God.' There is an interesting discussion of the passage—too long for quotation here—in J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, pp. 76 sqq.

---

[1] *Encycl. Biblica*, s.v. *Gospels* (col. 1881).

Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani. Mk quotes the Aramaic. Mt xxvii 46 has the Hebrew form *Eli*, and D and Old Lat. have here a form closer to the Hebrew in Mk also. Since the confusion with the name *Elijah* (verse 35), even as a wilful misunderstanding, depends for its plausibility upon the use of the Hebrew and not of the Aramaic form, it has been assumed that our Lord actually quoted the Psalm in Hebrew, and that the wording in Mk has been Aramaized.

35. Elijah was the recognized fore-runner and helper of the Messiah, and moreover there is evidence from Jewish sources that he was in popular legends believed to appear for the assistance of persons in distress.[1] The bystander's comment is only intelligible as a piece of bitter mockery, based on an intentional misunderstanding of our Lord's words.

36. It is not clear whether the person who at this point offers our Lord a drink of *vinegar* (or sour wine) on a sponge is to be understood as being a Jewish bystander, or as a Roman soldier. It has been argued that the *vinegar* was the soldiers' *posca*—the common drink of labourers and private soldiers—which had been brought for their refreshment during their period of duty by the Cross, and that no Jewish sympathizer would have been allowed either to approach the Cross, or to dispose of the soldiers' liquor. On the other hand, it has been argued that a Roman soldier, even if he were disposed to do an act of rough kindness to the Sufferer, would not have echoed the bystander's jest in doing so, since he would know nothing about Elijah—an argument, however, which sounds more conclusive than it really is, since it is known that of the Roman troops serving in Judaea a certain number were recruited from Sebaste (= Samaria), where a form of Judaism flourished.[2] C. H. Turner, who believes the doer of the act is to be understood as one of the soldiers, would solve the difficulty by taking all the words from *And one ran* to *Let be* inclusive as a 'Marcan parenthesis', and regarding *Let us see whether Elijah cometh to take him down* as a continuation of what was said by *some of them that stood by* in verse 35—a possible view. *Let be* in any case here probably means 'Give me leave', 'Allow me to do this'. In Mt xxvii 49, where the imperative, with the words which follow, is addressed not, as here, to the bystanders by the person who offered our Lord the vinegar, but by the bystanders to him in protest, *Let be* means probably 'Leave him alone!' (see, however, Moulton and Milligan, *V. G. T.*, i 97).

37. The loud cry with which our Lord expired—heard probably by the women from a distance (verse 40)—seems to have impressed the bystanders as in some way unusual, and was remembered in the

---

[1] For Rabbinic traditions about Elijah, see Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol ii, appendix viii.

[2] On the recruitment of Roman auxiliary troops from Sebaste, see Schürer II i 65, 126.

tradition. A person crucified would as a rule be, at the moment of death, too exhausted to cry out. It has been thought that our Lord's death was perhaps hastened by some internal rupture.

38. The rending of the Temple Veil is probably to be regarded as symbolizing the approaching destruction of the Jewish Temple. According to Jerome the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* had it that 'the lintel of the Temple, of marvellous size, fell down in fragments'. There is a passage in the Babylonian Talmud to the effect that 'Forty years before the fall of the Temple the doors of the Temple opened of themselves, until Rabbi Jochanan ben Zaccai rebuked them, saying, O Temple, Temple, why troublest thou thyself? I know that thine end is near.' There were two veils or curtains in the Temple, one before the Holy Place, the other before the Holy of Holies. It is probably the inner one which is here intended (cf. Ex xxvi 31 sqq., Lev xxi 23). The occurrence of the portent is supposed to synchronize with the moment of our Lord's death. For a mystical interpretation, see Heb x 20, vi 19.

39. The reading of R.V. mg. probably gives the right sense, though the shorter reading of R.V. text has better MS. authority. It was probably the loud cry which, together with our Lord's whole bearing throughout His Passion and the manner of His death, made the impression on the Roman officer. 'The reader is meant to infer from the Centurion's words that this heathen was brought to believe in the Divine Sonship of Jesus precisely by His death. He stands thus at the close of the Gospel as the prototype and fore-runner of the uncounted multitudes of heathen who shall be converted by the message of the Crucified. The conjecture lies close at hand that this Centurion also, though his name is not given (in the *Gospel of Peter* he is called Petronius), became at a later stage a member of the Christian Church. But this assumption is unnecessary. Moreover, his utterance need not be taken as a completely Christian confession of faith. The words are not *the Son of God* but *a son of God*,[1] and this need not mean more than that the Roman, in whose hearing something may have been said about the Messianic "Son of God", may have intended to say "Yes; He is truly a *son of God*."' (J. Weiss).

'The heathen form of utterance makes the tribute but the stronger. The Christian reader adds for himself, Yes; and other there is none' (B. W. Bacon). It is noteworthy that Lk xxiii 47 does not make the Centurion say more than that our Lord was 'a righteous man'. The word *centurion*, a transliteration from the Latin, used here by Mk in Greek, is replaced by a translation in the Greek of Mt xxvii 54, Lk xxiii 47. The Latinism in question is, however, not uncommon in the Greek of this period, and occurs in Polybius (VI xxiv 5).

---

[1] Cf. R.V. mg.

40–41. *The Women who beheld*

(Cf. Mt xxvii 55–56; Lk xxiii 49)

40 And there were also women beholding from afar: among whom *were* both Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of
41 James the less[1] and of Joses, and Salome; who, when he was in Galilee, followed him, and ministered unto him; and many other women which came up with him unto Jerusalem.

[1] Gr. *little*.

It is often supposed that the *women* here mentioned as having been eyewitnesses of the Passion *from afar* were the authorities from whom the account of our Lord's death was ultimately derived. But the Crucifixion happened in public, there must have been a large number of eyewitnesses, and the facts were notorious. The women who beheld the scene are here introduced by Mk rather to prepare for xv 47, xvi 1 sqq. than as guarantors of the truth of the preceding account of the Crucifixion. Lk mentions at a much earlier stage in his narrative a group of women who rendered service to our Lord in Galilee and contributed to His support (Lk viii 1–3), from which passage we gather that *Mary* of Magdala was a healed demoniac. The Latin tradition which identifies her with the sinful woman of Lk vii 37 is a groundless conjecture. *Salome* according to Mt xxvii 56 is to be identified with the wife of Zebedee. The second *Mary* is apparently described as *the mother of James the less and of Joses.* In xv 47 she is called *Mary of Joses* and in xvi 1 *Mary of James*,[1] phrases which, if they stood by themselves, would be most naturally understood as meaning 'Mary the daughter of Joses', and 'Mary the daughter of James' respectively. Some scholars are inclined to translate the words in the present passage 'Mary the daughter of James the less and mother of Joses', but the rendering is hardly the natural one. Wellhausen thinks there were two traditions as to the patronymic of this Mary, but that, since it was impossible for the same woman to have had two fathers, it was supposed that the two names must have been those of her children. Lagrange, however, points out that the description of a woman by reference to her children, though unusual in Greek, is common among modern Arabs, and suggests that the phrase is a Semitism. (Cf. also E. Meyer, *Ursprung u. Anfänge*, i 185 n.). The identification of *James the less* with James the son of Alphaeus (Mk iii 18) is conjectural. No doubt when the Gospel was written the persons named were all well known in the Christian tradition, and explanations were unnecessary. It has been thought that *James the less* or *the little* (R.V. mg.) was so named from his small stature, but Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, E.T., p. 144) produces evidence which goes to show that the phrase might be used to signify 'the younger' (of two brothers?)

---

[1] It is possible, however, that the names ought to be omitted from xvi 1, see below.

42–47. *The Burial of Jesus*

(Cf. Mt xxvii 57–61 ; Lk xxiii 50–56)

42 And when even was now come, because it was the Pre-
43 paration, that is, the day before the sabbath, there came
Joseph of Arimathaea, a councillor of honourable estate,
who also himself was looking for the kingdom of God; and
he boldly went in unto Pilate, and asked for the body of
44 Jesus. And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead: and
calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he
45 had been any while dead.[1] And when he learned it of the
46 centurion, he granted the corpse to Joseph. And he bought
a linen cloth, and taking him down, wound him in the linen
cloth, and laid him in a tomb which had been hewn out of
a rock; and he rolled a stone against the door of the tomb.
47 And Mary Magdalene and Mary the *mother* of Joses beheld
where he was laid.

[1] Many ancient authorities read *were already dead.*

The Gospel accounts of our Lord's burial have been elaborately studied—in opposition to the discussion of them in K. Lake's *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*—by C.H. Turner in an article in *The Church Quarterly Review* for July 1912. Loisy appears to be unique in regarding the burial by Joseph of Arimathaea as unhistorical. The Roman custom was to leave the bodies of those who were crucified hanging upon the crosses until they decayed, but it is probable that in Palestine a concession was made to Jewish religious scruples.[1] It appears, moreover, that from the time of Augustus onwards it was customary to grant the bodies, when once death had ensued, to the relatives or friends of the deceased, if they chose to apply for them, for the purpose of burial.[1] Joseph of Arimathaea was a man of position, a member of the Sanhedrin, who, if he chose to avow his sympathy with Jesus by approaching Pilate with a request for the body, might hope to secure it. Mk, who regards it as an act of great daring to approach the terrible Pilate, says that he *boldly went in*, i.e. he 'plucked up his courage and went'. To bury the dead, with the Jews as with the later Latin Church, was a 'corporal work of mercy' (cf. The Book of Tobit, *passim*). In the present case the matter was urgent, both because of the approach of the Sabbath (which began at nightfall), and also in view of the law of Dt xxi 22–23, which enjoined that the body of one who had been 'hanged' should not remain over night on the 'tree'. Pilate is surprised that the death of our Lord should have happened so quickly, but on verifying the facts readily grants Joseph's request: the somewhat brutal phrase *he granted the corpse* (the word *corpse* is only used here in the Gospels of the body of Jesus; elsewhere the more usual word for 'body' is used) may even possibly represent the official wording of the Governor's permission—*donavit cadaver.*[2] The burial took place with the utmost speed—in a rock-hewn tomb close to the place of crucifixion. There were many such tombs—chambers cut out of the solid rock, with *loculi* or recesses for the disposal of bodies, the entrance, after any burial had taken place there, being closed by a large stone—in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem, outside the city walls. Presumably Joseph, as a man of wealth, was assisted by servants whom he brought with him. According to the Fourth Gospel Nicodemus co-operated also (Jn xix 39). The women who were watching stayed long enough to mark the place.

---

[1] Josephus in the course of his narrative of the Jewish War remarks that 'the Jews used to take so much care of the burial of men that they took down those that were condemned and crucified and buried them before the going down of the sun (Josephus *De Bell. Jud.* IV v. 2).

42. Strictly speaking, *when even was now come* should mean 6 p.m. or sundown, when the Sabbath according to Jewish reckoning began. But Mk cannot mean to contradict himself in the two halves of the same sentence, and it must be supposed that the proceedings of Joseph of Arimathaea took place on the late afternoon of *the Preparation* (i.e. Friday, *the day before the Sabbath*, still called 'Preparation' or *paraskeue* in the Christian East): the explanatory note interpreting the term *Preparation* is for the benefit of Mk's non-Jewish readers.

43. *Arimathaea*, according to Eusebius and Jerome, is to be identified with a place near Lydda—the *Ramathaim* of 1 Macc xi 34—rather than with the *Ramathaim-zophim* of 1 Sam i 1. Joseph is to be understood not as being domiciled there, but as having originally come from there. He is described as a *councillor* (i.e. a member of the Sanhedrin): the word used would be understood by Mk's Roman readers as meaning a *senator*. The phrase *of honourable estate*

---

[1] *Encycl. Bibl.* s. v. '*Cross*'.

[2] Some, however, think that the word rendered *granted* means that Pilate granted the request without even expecting to be bribed for doing so.

represents a word meaning properly ‘of good social position’, which, however, in vulgar Greek was used to mean ‘rich’: so Mt (probably rightly) understood it here (Mt xxvii 57). The description of Joseph as *also himself looking for the Kingdom of God* (which Mk’s readers would understand in a Christian sense) suggests that he was a sympathizer, and all but a disciple: Mt’s definite statement that Joseph *also himself was Jesus’ disciple* (Mt xxvii 57) says perhaps rather too much. ‘St. John summarizes the general impression left by the other accounts as equivalent to “a disciple of Jesus, but not an open one”: Joseph, he means, like Nicodemus, would only have “come to Jesus by night”’ (C. H. Turner).

46. *Bought a linen cloth.* Clearly the Sabbath had not yet begun; and such an act would be extraordinary on the day of the Passover, which was the equivalent of a Sabbath. The purchase of the linen cloth is therefore generally regarded as an argument in favour of the Johannine dating of the Passover, though Dalman considers that it is not decisive (see Additional Notes, pp. 263 sq.). *Laid him in a tomb which had been hewn out of a rock.* Mt alone asserts that the tomb was Joseph’s own (Mt xxvii 60)—cf. Is xxii 16: Mt and Jn both say that it was ‘new’, i.e. that no burials had as yet taken place in it.

CHAPTER XVI

1–8. *The Discovery of the Empty Grave*

(Cf. Mt xxviii 1–8; Lk xxiv 1–9)

1 And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and
Mary the *mother* of James, and Salome, bought spices, that
2 they might come and anoint him. And very early on the
first day of the week, they come to the tomb when the sun
3 was risen. And they were saying among themselves, Who
shall roll us away the stone from the door of the tomb?
4 and looking up, they see that the stone is rolled back: for
5 it was exceeding great. And entering into the tomb, they
saw a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in
6 a white robe; and they were amazed. And he saith unto
them, Be not amazed: ye seek Jesus, the Nazarene, which
hath been crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold, the
7 place where they laid him! But go, tell his disciples and
Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see
8 him, as he said unto you. And they went out, and fled

> from the tomb; for trembling and astonishment had come upon them: and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid. . . .

The Sabbath ended at 6 p.m. on the Saturday evening, according to our reckoning. What is meant therefore, is that the women, after due observance of the Sabbath rest, bought spices, with a view to anointing the Lord's body, after sundown on Saturday, and approached the tomb, in order to carry out their purpose, as early as possible on Sunday morning. On the way to the tomb the difficulty occurs to them that the stone which they had seen rolled against the entrance was too heavy for women to move. Suddenly looking up and catching sight of the spot they perceive that the stone has already been rolled aside. The *young man* whom they find seated inside the tomb is meant to be understood as an angel. The suggestion of Lake, that what actually happened was that the women went by mistake to the wrong tomb, and that the attempt of a bystander to direct them to the right one was misunderstood,[1] is a rationalization which is utterly foreign to the spirit of the narrative. The modern mind must make its count as best it can with the supernatural: the earliest Church believed in the objective reality of angels, as it believed in the objective reality of demons, and what Mk wishes to describe is the annunciation of the resurrection of Jesus to the women by the message of an angel. The further message, which they are instructed to convey to the disciples (verse 7), is difficult—see below. The women are described as being seized with an access of fear and supernatural awe (cf. iv 41, vi 49–50, ix 6). They are afraid to say anything to any one, and run away from the spot. How long Mk considered their silence to have been maintained we are unable to say, since the authentic text of the Gospel at this point breaks off—in all probability in the middle of a sentence.

1. There is 'Western' authority for omitting the names of the women from this verse, and C. H. Turner points out that if the names had stood in the text used by Mt, it is unlikely that he would have omitted the name of Salome (cf. Mt xxviii 1). J. V. Bartlet suggests that the names were inserted from Mk xv 40 when Mk's text was divided into sections for reading in church. An Easter 'Gospel' would begin at this point, and the names must be mentioned in order to specify the subject of the verb. Without the names, the sentence runs straight on from xv 47, *sc. And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid, and when the sabbath was past, they bought spices, &c.* The aromatic *spices* appear from the context to have been oils for the anointing of the dead. Since the women arrived too late to effect their purpose, the Christian tradition regarded the act of the woman at Bethany

---

[1] K. Lake, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, pp. 251–252.

(xiv 3–9—see notes *ad loc.*) as an anticipatory anointing of our Lord's body for the tomb. Jn xix 39–40 regards the full funeral rites as having been already carried out by Joseph of Arimathaea and Nicodemus. Those who are anxious to harmonize the accounts point out that this need not have been known to the women. Mt xxviii 1 says simply that the women came in order *to see the sepulchre.*

2. *Very early* is probably not meant to be in conflict with the statement that the sun was already risen. Some texts soften the apparent difficulty by omitting *very* and reading 'as the sun was rising'. Swete is not likely to be right in thinking that the women started before dawn but did not reach the tomb until after sunrise. As Burkitt remarks, there is no real incongruity, and *very early* means simply 'as early as they possibly could'.[1]

4. *For it was exceeding great.* The words would have come more logically after the women's question in verse 3, to which position they are transferred in some texts. But the roughness of style is quite Marcan. The Latin MS. *k* introduces here a description of the actual Resurrection—'But suddenly at the third hour of the day there was darkness over the whole circle of the earth, and angels descended from the heavens and rising'—the text should probably be emended so as to read 'and the Lord rising'—'in the glory of the living God they ascended with him, and straightway it was light. Then the women went to the tomb and they see the stone rolled away: for it was exceeding great.' The gloss has, of course, no authority, and shows affinities with the *Gospel of Peter*, which has a somewhat similar story.[2]

5. For *young man* as a description of an angel cf. 2 Macc. iii 26, 33, and for *white robes* as worn by the denizens of heaven cf. Rev. vii 13, and the account of our Lord's Transfiguration (Mk ix 3).

6. It would be possible to punctuate the angel's words as a question, *sc.* 'Are ye seeking Jesus the Nazarene which hath been crucified? He is risen, &c.'

7–8. A reference back to xiv 28. But our Lord's saying there speaks only of 'going before them' into Galilee, and has nothing to correspond with *there shall ye see him.* C. H. Turner is probably right in holding that the latter words are to be understood as a parenthesis, so that the verse should be punctuated *But go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee* (*there shall ye see him*) *as he said unto you.* Peter is mentioned apart from the others —as the disciple who denied his Lord, or as the disciple in whom the Roman Church was specially interested? The sequel, if it had come down to us, would almost certainly have contained an account of how the Lord forgave and restored S. Peter (cf. 1 Cor xv 5, Lk xxiv 34, Jn xxi 15 sqq.). Is the Gospel leading up to a tradition of appearances of the Risen Lord to S. Peter and the others in Galilee, rather than in Jerusalem? Or are we to discount any such inference from verse 7, in view of the fact that verse 8 suggests that the women failed to deliver the angel's message? On the problems presented by these verses, and on the lost ending of the Gospel, see Additional Notes, pp. 267 sqq.

---

[1] *J. T. S.*, vol. xiv, p. 544.

[2] Cf. M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 92; Gk. text in E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, p. 19.

9–20. *The Longer Ending*

9 [1] Now when he was risen early on the first day of the
week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from whom he
10 had cast out seven devils.[2] She went and told them that
11 had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they,
when they heard that he was alive, and had been seen of
her, disbelieved.

12 And after these things he was manifested in another
form unto two of them, as they walked, on their way into
13 the country. And they went away and told it unto the
rest: neither believed they them.

14 And afterward he was manifested unto the eleven themselves as they sat at meat; and he upbraided them with
their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed
15 not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he
said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the
16 gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is
baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be
17 condemned. And these signs shall follow them that believe:
in my name shall they cast out devils;[2] they shall speak
18 with new[3] tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they
drink any deadly thing, it shall in no wise hurt them; they
shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.

19 So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken unto them,
was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right
20 hand of God. And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the
word by the signs that followed. Amen.

---

[1] The two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end. Some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel.

[2] Gr. *demons*.

[3] Some ancient authorities omit *new*.

This appendix to the Gospel, found in the majority of extant MSS., is missing from ℵ and B, and in four other uncials it occurs preceded by the Shorter Ending, in three of the four cases preceded also by a note saying, 'This also is current'. It is missing from the Latin MS. *k* (which contained the shorter ending), also from the oldest form of the Syriac version and from three of the oldest MSS. of the Armenian. Its absence from the majority of the best Greek MSS. known in their time is noticed by Eusebius and Jerome. It was accordingly ignored both by the 'Ammonian sections' and by the 'Eusebian canons'—i.e. divisions of the Gospels prepared for reading in Church. The evidence points to its having formed no part of the oldest texts current in Africa, Alexandria, Caesarea, Antioch. There is an Armenian MS. of the tenth century which suggests that it is 'of the Presbyter Ariston'—to be identified probably with the 'Aristion' mentioned by Papias (*apud* Euseb., *H. E.* iii 39, 4) as having been 'a disciple of the Lord', like 'John the Presbyter'. The theory that it was actually written by Aristion has been taken seriously by a number of scholars, but Streeter argues convincingly against it: it was simply a brilliant but erroneous conjecture on the part of some one who wished to find for it a sub-apostolic author, and who was familiar with the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius.[1] Its composition must be placed either in Rome or in Asia, probably early in the second century or at the end of the first, since it was known to Tatian (*c.* 140), was quoted most probably by Justin Martyr (before 163), and is definitely quoted as from 'Mark' by Irenaeus (*c.* 180). In favour of Asia is the possible allusion to the story which according to Eusebius was found in Papias of the escape of an early Christian from death after drinking poison (see on verse 18 *infra*), and the apparent point of contact with the Fourth Gospel in xvi 9 (cf. Jn xx 11 sqq.). Streeter, however, who points out that the appearance to Mary Magdalene might be either an inference from Mt xxviii 9 sqq. or derived simply from oral tradition, and that the story about the poison might quite well have independently reached Rome, thinks that Rome was the place of origin of the document, in which there is a notable absence of any allusion to the disbelief of Thomas (Jn xx 24 sqq.) or to other elements in the Johannine tradition, and that 'everything in it, except the mention of the Appearance to Mary and the drinking poison, appears to be derived either from the Gospel of Luke or the Acts. . . . The natural inference . . . is that the Longer Conclusion was written in a Church where Luke and Acts had been long established, but where Matthew, if known at all, had only recently been accepted.'[2]

The fragment is based, then, on the Lucan writings, supplemented by Mt and oral tradition. It does not appear to have been originally written as a continuation of the Gospel, since it links on very awkwardly with xvi 8, introducing the theme of the Resurrection *de novo* with our Lord (though without naming Him) as the subject of the sentence, and referring to Mary Magdalene as though she had not been mentioned before, and with the descriptive note *from whom he had cast out seven devils* added from Lk viii 2. The whole reads like a summary compiled for catechetical use, and shows, as Sir A. F. Hort has pointed out, a strong desire 'to point a moral', the moral being that '*unhesitating faith in the Gospel of the risen Jesus . . . is incumbent on all who hear that Gospel* on the basis of his original witnesses' (J. V. Bartlet). The 'upbraiding' of the eleven for *their unbelief and hardness of heart* in verse 14 is more strongly worded than in any of the canonical Gospels, and is even in superficial conflict with the probable source of the story (Lk xxiv 36 sqq.).

---

[1] B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 344 sqq.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 350.

10. The *Gospel of Peter* (§ 7) says that the disciples 'sat mourning and weeping night and day until the Sabbath'. It is more probable that Pseudo-Peter knew Mk xvi 10 than *vice versa*. The view that there is a point of contact here with Jn xvi 20 is unlikely.

11. Cf. Lk xxiv 11.

12. Cf. Lk xxiv 13–35, compressed here into two sentences. *In another form.* From the fact that the Risen Lord was not at first recognized by the two disciples (Lk xxiv 16, 31), the author of these verses seems to have been led to think of a 'metamorphosis' like that at the Transfiguration (cf. Mk ix 2, and notes *ad loc.*).

13. Contrast Lk xxiv 33–34.

14. Cf. Lk xxiv 41–43. The *unbelief* ascribed to the Apostles is stressed for homiletic purposes as 'a typical instance of human *unbelief and hardness of heart*' (Bartlet). The 'Freer Logion'—inserted at this point in W (see below, p. 248)—was already known to S. Jerome, who quotes part of it in Latin, and states that it was found 'in certain copies and especially in Greek codices' (Hieron. *Adv. Pelag.* ii 15).

15. Cf. Lk xxiv 47, Acts i 8, Mt xxviii 19, Mk xiii 10. *The whole creation* here = 'all mankind'; cf. Col i 23, *Didache* xvi 5, *Pirke Aboth* i 12 (where 'the creatures' is used for 'mankind'), 2 Esdras v 44, 45.

17. The appeal on behalf of the truth of Christianity to the evidence of successful exorcisms is frequent in the writings of the Apologists: cf. Justin, *Apol.* ii 6, *Dial.* 76; Tertull. *Apol.* 23; Minucius Felix, *Octav.* 27; and in the N.T., Acts xvi 17–18, xix 13. For speaking with *tongues* cf. 1 Cor xiv; Acts ii 4 sqq., x 46 (if the original text had *new tongues* Acts ii 4 sqq. was doubtless especially in mind).

18. *They shall take up serpents*: cf. Acts xxviii 3 sqq. *If they drink any deadly thing*: an apparent allusion to the story told by Eusebius on the authority of Papias, according to which Justus, surnamed Barsabbas, drank a deadly poison, and yet, by the grace of the Lord, suffered no harm (Euseb. *H. E.* iii 39, 9). For 'gifts of healing' cf. 1 Cor xii 9, 28, Acts v 12, ix 12, xxviii 8, and (with use of unction), Jas v 14, 15.

19. Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* iii 10, 6) quotes this verse as from Mk. For *received up* cf. Acts i 2, 11. The metaphor of session at the Right Hand of God, frequent in the N.T., is derived from Ps cx 1 (cf. Mk xii 35 sqq.).

20. A summary statement, resuming the conviction of the triumphant universality of the Church which is characteristic of the Book of the Acts.

⌜ *The Shorter Ending* ⌝

And all that had been commanded them they briefly reported to Peter and those who were with him. And after this Jesus himself appeared to them, and from the East and as far as to the West sent forth through them the sacred and incorruptible proclamation of eternal salvation.

This is found in four Greek uncial MSS. prefixed to the Longer Ending, which is added as an alternative. It is also found in a Greek cursive MS., and in the margin of another: in the text of the Sahidic and Ethiopic versions, and in the African Latin MS. *k*: in the margin of the Harclean Syriac, and in the oldest MS. of the Bohairic version. Unlike the Longer Ending, it was clearly written for its present position as 'an attempt by some early editor to heal the gaping wound' (Streeter). It evidently had at one time a considerable circulation, but was eventually supplanted by the Longer Ending, which appeared more complete. Like the Longer Ending, it was probably written at Rome. The phrase *from the East as far as to the West* is possibly echoed by Clement (*Ad Corinth.* v 6), who wrote from Rome about A. D. 96.

⌜ *The Freer Logion* ⌝

And they replied saying, This age of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan, who † by means of evil spirits does not permit the true power of God to be apprehended; † wherefore reveal thy righteousness now. They were speaking to Christ, and Christ said to them in reply: The limit of the years of the authority of Satan has been fulfilled, but other terrible things draw near. And on behalf of sinners I was delivered over unto death, that they might turn unto the truth and sin no more, in order that they may inherit the spiritual and immortal glory of righteousness, which is in heaven.

---

† The Greek is partially corrupt: the words between the two obeli are translated from the Latin of S. Jerome's quotation.

This curious gloss, the opening words of which are quoted in a Latin version by S. Jerome (see notes on xvi 14 *supra*), is incorporated in the text of the Longer Ending of Mk after xvi 14 in a fifth-century Greek MS. discovered in Egypt in 1906, and now commonly called W, or the Washington MS., but known formerly as the Freer MS., from the name of its original American owner. Its occurrence is regarded by Streeter as lending support to the hypothesis that Mk xvi 9–20 at one time was a separate document—'a catechetical summary is a document which lends itself to expansion'. J. V. Bartlet thinks that the insertion 'is almost certainly taken from some early second-century Christian writing', and that originally the Apostles were not apologizing so much for their own unbelief, as for the difficulty which 'the truth of God' had in gaining power over men's minds under the conditions of the present evil 'age'. I do not, however, see why the fragment should not have been composed *ad hoc* as a gloss on Mk xvi 14 by some one who felt that the *unbelief and hardness of heart* ascribed to the Apostles required explanation. The explanation he found in their despondency because the Kingdom of God had not yet come: they ask for an *immediate* Parousia or revelation of the Divine Righteousness. The Lord assures them for their comfort that the power of Satan is already broken: the 'limit of the years' has been 'fulfilled'. Nevertheless, there are other 'terrible things' in prospect (the Church, when this *logion* was written, had known persecution !). Meanwhile, since the purpose of the Lord's death had been the conversion and salvation of sinners, *Go ye into all the world, &c.* The interpolation of the glossator is indeed poor and clumsy in style, but the sequence of thought is quite clear.

ADDITIONAL NOTES

(1) *Mk* i 1–4

(i) The view adopted in the commentary (pp. 5–6) with regard to the punctuation and criticism of these verses is substantially that of Holtzmann. The argument for the dependence of Mk i 2 on 'Q' appears conclusive, and disposes completely of the suggestion of Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, E.T., p. 162) that the combination of Mal iii 1 with Is xl 3 already existed *as a combination*, which *as a whole* was handed down as a word 'of the Prophet Isaiah', in some *Semitic* Christian source, and that the translator who rendered it into Greek gave the LXX of Is xl 3 because he was able to find the reference in his Greek Bible, and translated the verse from Malachi independently, because he was *not* able to find the LXX reference.[1] The further conclusion that Mal iii 1 is an interpolation in the text of Mk i 2, if less irresistible, is at least highly probable. Lagrange accepts Holtzmann's argument with regard to both these points. Wellhausen and others go further and regard the verse from Isaiah also as being an interpolation; the evidence, however, of Mt iii 3 compared with Lk iii 4 renders this inadmissible, unless the theory be intended to apply only to a hypothetical *Urmarcus*.

(ii) The view that verse 1 stands by itself and is intended to serve as a kind of superscription or title for the Gospel as a whole is endorsed by the judgement of a formidable array of scholars: e.g. J. Weiss, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Swete, Menzies, Bacon, Montefiore all declare themselves in its favour; and it is capable of being attractively presented. Thus it can be argued, for example, that the entire earthly life and career of Jesus constituted only 'the beginning of the Gospel' (cf. Acts i 1, Heb ii 3), and that 'the end is not yet' (Mk xiii 7). The thought is true enough, and the implied recognition that the history of the Church is a true sequel to the Gospel is important. 'Jesus', as Wellhausen says,[2] 'cannot be understood in abstraction from His influence in history, and if He is cut adrift from this, He is robbed of His main significance.' Nevertheless, I cannot persuade myself that Mk i 4 is not the natural continuation of verse 1; and it seems to me that a simpler and less sophisticated interpretation is secured by so taking it.

---

[1] Unless indeed the Semitic source in question be taken to be the original Aramaic version of 'Q': a highly improbable supposition, since the two prophecies are not likely to have stood in combination in that source.

[2] *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 2nd Ed., p. 104.

(iii) The history of the use of the term 'Gospel' (*evangelion*) in early Christian literature has been exhaustively investigated by Harnack (*Constitution and Law of the Church*, Appendix III). Despite his elaborate argument with regard to the use of the term in Mk, in which it is maintained that i 14, 15 is the key-passage for the Marcan use of *evangelion*, and that in this Gospel it *always* means the Good News of the Kingdom, proclaimed by Jesus—'the gospel . . . of the nearness of the Kingdom' (E.T., p. 284)—I am wholly unconvinced. Harnack's view virtually makes 'Gospel' already a technical term in Mk, and that, too, in a sense other than that which the word came to bear in later Christian usage. It appears to me that the word, the use of which, with that of the corresponding verb, is predominantly Pauline and Lucan apart from its use by Mk, belongs essentially to the vocabulary of the Gentile Mission, and means simply 'a proclamation of Good News'. Later, it was specialized so as to mean *the* 'Gospel' in the sense of 'the Christian message as a whole', 'the essentials of Christian truth'. In Mk it has hardly yet become a *vox technica* except when it is used absolutely: thus in *for my sake and the Gospel's sake* (Mk viii 35, cf. x 29) the words 'and the Gospel's sake' look like a missionary's addition to the words of our Lord, very much to the point in circumstances in which converts were liable to be martyred 'on account of their adhesion to the message of Good News': and in xiii 10, xiv 9 the Evangelist probably understood by 'the Gospel' the preaching of Christianity as a whole. But the meaning in i 1 and i 14 is determined quite simply by the respective contexts: *the Gospel of Jesus Christ* means 'Good News about Jesus Christ', just as *Gospel of God* probably means 'Good News about God'. It is *possible* that in the latter passage the meaning is 'Good News *from* God': but it is artificial to insist on rendering these passages as though they *must* mean respectively 'Good News of which Jesus Christ is the author' and 'Good News of which God is the ultimate author'. The procedure of W. C. Allen, who follows Harnack in this matter, is necessitated by the very early date and Palestinian origin which he assumes for Mk.

Our Lord, of course, will not have spoken Greek and cannot have used the term 'Gospel' at all, but there is no reason why He should not have used an Aramaic phrase expressive of 'good tidings', or quoted Is lxi 1 (cf. Mt xi 5, Lk iv 18, vii 22).

(2) *The Significance of our Lord's Baptism*

That the sinless Christ should have been baptized of John, whose baptism was primarily a *baptism of repentance unto remission of sins* (Mk i 4), presented already a difficulty to the mind of the compiler of Mt (cf. Mt iii 14–15). The *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, as quoted by Jerome, suggests a different explanation: 'Lo, the mother of the Lord and his brethren kept saying to him, John the Baptist is baptizing with a view to the remission of sins: let us go and be baptized by him. But he said unto them, What sin have I committed, that I should go and be baptized by him? *Unless, indeed, this very utterance of mine involves a sin of ignorance.*'[1] It has been argued seriously that this explanation may be the true one: the term 'sin' in Hebrew thought is not quite identical in its meaning with our modern usage of the word, and it has been maintained that according to Hebrew ideas it would be impossible for one who was truly *man* to be certain of his own sinlessness, since according to the O.T. and the whole Hebrew point of view sins of ignorance—unconscious sins—were inevitable (cf. Job iv 18–19, xv 15; 1 Cor iv 4; Mk x 18). So Dr. Bethune-Baker allows himself to write 'The baptism of Jesus at the hands of John implies His own consciousness of the need of repentance and so the sense of sin—though later Christian thought could not tolerate this idea, and converted what was surely one of our Lord's deepest human experiences into a merely outward and formal ceremony performed for the sake of example to others.'[2]

This does not seem to me to be a probable solution. The word 'sinlessness' is confessedly a negative and somewhat unsatisfactory term,[3] and a negative universal statement can never be *proved*; but it appears, nevertheless, quite impossible to explain the earliest Christians' faith in Jesus, and the valuation which they set upon His Person, unless they at least discovered in Him the supreme incarnation and embodiment of perfect holiness, and were convinced beyond all question that He was 'without spot of sin'.[4] It appears equally impossible to explain our Lord's own attitude towards His mission, and the Messianic *rôle* which He plainly claimed, unless He, too, who (in a phrase of Sir G. A. Smith's) 'had the surest moral judgement ever known upon earth', was wholly unconscious of any cloud having at any time intervened to mar the purity of His relationship to His heavenly Father. 'The baptism of repentance', writes M. Loisy, 'did not render guilty those who came to receive it without sin: a righteous Man might avail himself of it as a means of expressing the will to live a pure life, without acknowledging sins which he had not committed.'[5]

The true explanation of our Lord's Baptism would appear rather to be this. Our Lord, from His boyhood onwards, will have been conscious of standing in a peculiar relation towards God,[1] and of being destined to some great vocation; as He 'increased in wisdom and stature' and grew to manhood at Nazareth, He may have been led already—perhaps helped by the tradition of a Davidic lineage in the family into which He was born[2]—to conceive that it might be His destiny to be Israel's Anointed King. As He waited for some sign from the heavenly Father, the rumour of the Baptist's preaching ran through the country-side—'The time is at hand!' Is it not likely that the Lord recognized His appointed hour? Elijah the Fore-runner had appeared, the Restorer of the tribes, he of whom tradition asserted that it belonged to his office to anoint the Coming King. That our Lord recognized the Baptist as His Elijah and that John made upon Him a profound impression we know from His own words.[3] His coming represented a new era in the history of God's dealings with His people. And John meanwhile was calling Israel to Repentance. What was the proper attitude of God's Messiah towards such a movement? Not, surely, to stand aloof, but to take part in it: for the Messiah was to be the representative of Israel; it became Him to be 'in all things made like unto His brethren'. It was the whole meaning of the Incarnation that God was in Christ identified with sinners, and the self-identification of Christ with a sinful people cannot with any kind of propriety be eradicated from the story of His life. 'Woe is me, for . . . I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips'—the Lord could echo the second part of Isaiah's confession,[4] if not the first; like Daniel, He will have confessed 'the sins of His people',[5] with whom He felt Himself to be identified; and who *should* express penitence for the national sins, if not the Messiah? So He was baptized of John in the Jordan, and the act was no mere 'outward and formal ceremony', but one of the profoundest experiences of His life.

---

[1] Ecce mater Domini et fratres eius dicebant ei: Ioannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum; eamus ut baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis: Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? Nisi forte hoc ipsum, quod dixi, ignorantia est. (*Ev. sec. Hebr.*, apud Hieron., *contra Pelag.* iii 2.)

[2] *The Faith of the Apostles' Creed*, p. 117.

[3] Cf. W. H. Moberly in *Foundations*, p. 305.

[4] Cf. J. Weiss, *Christ: The Beginnings of Dogma*, E.T., pp. 21, 22.

[5] Loisy, *Les Evangiles Synoptiques* i 405.

Immediately afterwards He goes into the wilderness to wrestle with temptation: and the temptations which there assailed Him, symbolically expressed in the account which Mt and Lk derived apparently from 'Q'[6] and which Mk perhaps presupposed, are all plainly concerned with the question of the *meaning* of the Messianic *rôle* which our Lord was henceforth called upon to fulfil.[7] Is it conceivable that the fact that He had come freshly from a Baptism which was concerned with the idea of 'repentance' and the 'remission of sins' was without any bearing at all upon the interpretation of the Messiahship which came to prevail in our Lord's own mind? It is generally held by those who assign any historical value to the Gospel picture of the Baptism that it was this event, together with the great experience by which it was accompanied, which set the seal upon our Lord's convictions about the Messiahship. What was it actually that had happened when Jesus was baptized? 'Elijah' had not anointed Him with any literal oil, but instead had plunged Him beneath the waters of repentance.[1] But as He came up out of those waters there burst upon Him, with renewed certainty, the conviction that He was indeed the Son of God,[2] *together with the consciousness of supreme endowment with the plenitude of spiritual authority and power.* May we not assume that there will have started up in His mind, with an entirely new light thrown upon their meaning, certain familiar passages in Isaiah? We have to remember that our Lord will have read the O.T., not as a modern critic does, distinguishing different authorships, but as a Jew would be accustomed to read it. For Him the Book of Isaiah was a single whole. In that book were contained the classical passages about the Davidic King, but the same book contained also, in its later sections, the four great passages about the ideal Servant of the Lord. *There was one idea which linked all these passages together, and that was the idea of spiritual anointing.* It stood written concerning the Davidic King that he should be equipped with a special endowment of the Holy Spirit;[3] so also of the 'Servant' it was written: 'I have put my Spirit upon him.'[4] Another passage which fitted into the same general sequence of ideas is the one which lies behind our Lord's reply at a later date to the Baptist's message.[5] S. Luke makes our Lord quote this passage explicitly in the Synagogue at Nazareth,[6] and it is important to notice that *this is the solitary O.T. passage from which could be derived the idea of a person being 'anointed'* (*i.e.* *made a 'Christ'*) *with an unction not of oil but of the Holy Spirit.*

---

[1] According to Lk ii 49 He already at the age of twelve describes the Temple as His 'Father's House'.

[2] See Bishop Chase, *Belief and Creed*, pp. 60 sqq.

[3] Mk ix 12, 13; cf. also the sayings (from 'Q') recorded in Mt xi 7 sqq.; Lk vii 24 sqq., xvi 16.

[4] Is vi 5.

[5] Dan ix 20.

[6] Mt iv 1-11, Lk iv 1-13.

[7] The profoundest modern study of the inner meaning of our Lord's Temptation is that contained in the 'Grand Inquisitor' chapter of Dostoevsky's novel, *The Brothers Karamazov*. For a quasi-political interpretation see Stephen Liberty, *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry* (Oxford, 1916).

If our Lord's mind moved at all along these lines it seems to me that at once we get a clue to the proper historical meaning of His ministry. *The true Son of David was the Anointed of the Spirit, who was also the Lord's ideal Servant*: and that meant at once that His *rôle* was a *religious rôle.* The political associations of the 'Son of David' conception fell away: the true royalty was that of service, as our Lord subsequently explained to the disciples after the ambitious request of Zebedee's sons.[7] The true King would be a lowly King of Peace.[1] The Messianic 'glory' would come later—after the Servant's death, as Isaiah liii 10 sqq. suggested. It was only then that the Son of Man would be seen coming in His Kingdom: and *that* would be the day of the 'Kingdom of God', for which the present mission of Jesus was preparatory. The 'Son of Man' conception from Daniel and Enoch[2] here enters in to form the basis of our Lord's belief about the *future* Kingdom, and the *rôle* which He Himself as Messiah would play therein. His interpretation of His *immediate* mission here upon earth, as the *Messias designatus* who has already been 'anointed' by the Spirit,[3] I believe to have been based almost wholly upon the Messianic passages in Isaiah. He was Son of David, but not as the people understood it. He could neither affirm nor deny that He was Son of David. A greater than Solomon was here.[4] He was not Son of David in the ordinary sense.[5] The 'Servant passages' had transformed for Him the entire conception. Meanwhile it is His mission 'to proclaim good tidings to the poor',[6] and He is not anxious to accept testimony, either from demons[7] or from any one else, or to be hailed, in the early stages of His Ministry, as Messiah, because of the politico-theocratic associations of the term in the popular mind.

---

[1] The idea of an application of Is liii 12 ('He was numbered with the transgressors') already lay near at hand, though of course we cannot assume that this particular passage was before our Lord's mind in any explicit way *at the time*: see, however, Lk xxii 37.

[2] i.e. the Davidic King (Ps ii 7, 2 Sam vii 14).

[3] Is xi 2 sqq.

[4] Is xlii 1.

[5] Is lxi 1, Mt xi 4, Lk vii 22.

[6] Lk iv 17 sqq.

[7] Mk x 41 sqq.

I venture to put forward the above view in spite of what has been written recently by Dr. Burkitt in *Christian Beginnings*, pp. 35 sqq. I cannot think that the fact that the word *'ebed*, used of the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah, properly means 'slave' rather than 'servant' in our modern sense of the term, constitutes any reason why our Lord should not have thought of Himself as being called to fulfil the ideal *rôle* of Israel as the 'slave of Yahweh'. It is true that the specific allusions to the 'Servant' passages in the recorded words of our Lord are few in number.[8] But the argument does not depend so much upon the quotation of specific texts, as upon the part played by the two ideas of *suffering* and of *service* in the teaching of Jesus as a whole. Suffering, it is implied, is to be the vocation of every true servant of the Lord, every son of the coming Kingdom; suffering, in particular, is to be the destiny of the Son of Man: and the idea of service transvalues that of royalty. These are ideas which are profoundly characteristic of our Lord's teaching, and they *appear*, at least, to be derived from the Book of Isaiah. They can, indeed, have no other O.T. background; and the very early utilization of the 'Servant passages' in connexion with our Lord[1] by the disciples after the Resurrection (assumed by Burkitt to have arisen in Greek-speaking Christianity and to be based on the LXX) is most reasonably explained if we suppose that they owed the clue to such an interpretation to the Lord Himself.

---

[1] Zech ix 9–10; cf. Mk xi 2 sqq.

[2] See Introduction, p. liv.

[3] As David was anointed by Samuel (1 Sam xvi 13), so that *the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon David from that day forward* with a view to a sovereignty upon which he was only actually to enter in the future.

[4] Mt xii 42, Lk xi 31.

[5] Mk xii 35 sqq.

[6] Lk iv 18.

[7] Mk i 25, 34; iii 11, 12; v 6–8.

[8] Actual or possible instances are Lk xxii 37 (= Is. liii 12); Lk iv 18 (= Is lxi 1, 2; cf. Mt xi 5, Lk vii 22); Mk x 45 (= Mt xx 28 = Is liii 11, 12 ?); Mk xiv 21 (= Mt xxvi 24, Lk xxii 22); Lk xxiv 26, 27; to which may be added Mt xxi 13 (= Lk xix 46 = Is lvi 7); Mk iii 27 (= Mt xii 29, Lk xi 21 = allusion to Is xlix 24, 25 ?); Mt quotes on his own account Is xlii 1–4 (Mt xii 18–21) and liii 4 (Mt viii 17).

(3) *Mk* i 40–45

This section has caused great difficulty to the commentators. H. G. Wood in *Peake's Commentary* thinks that if the reading *being angry* is original in verse 41, the implied flattery of the Physician will be the cause of our Lord's displeasure, and follows Klostermann in comparing Epictetus iii 10 ('Why then dost thou flatter the physician? Why dost thou say, If thou wilt, sir, I shall be well?') Gould thinks that 'our Lord is vexed at the whole situation of which the man makes a part, at the clamour over the mere externals of his work, and this is expressed in some sharp word, with which he accompanies the thrusting of him out of the house'. B. Weiss is of opinion that the cure was gradual and had only begun, and that our Lord turns the man out because he was still unclean and infectious. Holtzmann, while recognizing that the story as it stands implies a miracle, thinks that originally the leper was already healed, or believed himself to be so, when he came to our Lord, and wished only to be *pronounced* clean (the word translated *make me clean* could bear that meaning). Our Lord, in other words, is asked, as a great prophet, to take it upon Himself to dispense the man from the obligation of complying with the Law, and refuses to do so: He shows the man by His touch that He does regard Him as clean: nevertheless the legal requirement must be fulfilled. Menzies with some hesitation inclines also to this view, though admitting that it is not a real interpretation of the text. J. Weiss, for whom the incident is unhistorical, thinks that the story arose in narrowly legalist Christian circles.

(4) *Sons of the bride-chamber* (*Mk* ii 19)

The word rendered *bride-chamber* in this passage is used also in Mt xxii 10, where a variant reading has *marriage*: according to its formation it should mean *a bride's quarters*, and it is used in this sense in Tobit vi 14, 17 (LXX). A. Pallis (*A few notes on the Gospels according to S. Mark and S. Matthew*) thinks that in Mk it means a

---

[1] Acts viii 32 sqq.; cf. Acts iii 13, 26; iv 27, 30, where R.V. rightly renders 'Servant'.

banqueting-hall (probably hired for the purpose) in which the wedding feast took place, and that *the sons of the bride-chamber* means simply *the guests at a wedding* (Pallis, *op. cit.*, pp. 6–7 ; cf. A. H. McNeile on Mt ix 15).

(5) *The demand for a 'Sign'* (*Mk* viii 11 *sqq.*)

The demand of the Pharisees for a 'sign' from heaven is deeply rooted in the Gospel tradition, and is undoubtedly historical. That the 'Kingdom of God', proclaimed by Jesus as 'at hand', would be heralded by supernatural and premonitory signs, was part of the received apocalyptic tradition (cf. Mk xiii 4 and parallels ; also Lk xvii 20–21, a possible variant of the Pharisees' request for a sign). The demand, then, is probably for a 'sign' authenticating the approaching 'end of the Age'. The earliest version of our Lord's reply will be that of 'Q', viz. *An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign ; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah the prophet* (Mt xii 39, xvi 4 ; Lk xi 29), the meaning of which is that the fact of the appearance among God's people of One who, upon any showing, was at least, like Jonah, a prophet summoning men to repentance, was 'sign' sufficient that Judgement was at hand. The selection of *Jonah* as a type of prophetic activity may further suggest that Jerusalem has sunk to the spiritual level of Nineveh (cf. our Lord's foreboding of doom upon the city in Mk xiii) ; nay, *the men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it : for they repented at the preaching of Jonah ; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here* (Mt xii 41, Lk xi 32).

But the demand for a 'sign' was not confined to the Pharisees, or to the period of Jesus' life on earth. Men wanted evidence in Apostolic days that Christianity was true ; and a 'sign' was needed, not indeed for the *evil and adulterous generation* of those whom no 'sign' would convince, but for the reassurance of those who were disposed to believe, but whose faith was weak.[1] And it would seem that the Church in early days pointed, in the main, to two such 'signs', viz. (1) the fact of the Resurrection, and (2) the observance of the Eucharist, as interpreted by the faith and the experience of the Church. In a very real sense these two were in fact one, since it was specifically with the *Risen* Christ that the faithful held spiritual communion in the Eucharist (cf. Lk xxiv 30–35), as is evident *inter alia* from the fact that Sunday, rather than Friday, has from the beginning been the weekly eucharistic festival in the Christian Church.

Accordingly, in the Gospel tradition as it came to be developed in Apostolic times, we find (1) that the 'sign of Jonah' is reinterpreted in Mt xii 40 as being prophetic of our Lord's Resurrection,[1] (2) that Mk by omitting all reference to Jonah, converts our Lord's words to the Pharisees into the point-blank denial *to them* of any 'sign' whatsoever, while at the same time hinting in the verses which immediately follow (see Commentary) that the true sign, if they had insight to understand it, was the 'sign of the Loaves' interpreted as symbolizing the Eucharist, and (3) that in the Fourth Gospel the demand for a 'sign' is connected in different contexts with *both* these two themes (Jn ii 18–22, vi 30–65).

---

[1] Cf. B. H. Streeter in *Foundations*, pp. 129, 144.

(6) *The Injunctions of Secrecy* (*Mk* ix 9 *and other passages*)

The injunction of secrecy until *the Son of Man should have risen again from the dead*, ascribed to our Lord in Mk ix 9, appears to fall into line with a number of other passages in which Jesus is represented in this Gospel as being anxious, apparently, to avoid being known or acknowledged in any public fashion as Messiah during His lifetime (cf. i 25, 34, iii 12, viii 30). W. Wrede, in his famous monograph on the 'Messianic Secret' in the Gospels,[2] has made them the basis, with other passages, of a comprehensive theory of the development of the Gospel tradition as a whole, which is sufficiently important to deserve detailed examination.

Wrede draws attention, in the first place, to the remarkable fashion in which the demons, who are regarded as speaking through the possessed, are constantly represented as recognizing our Lord and as making Him known (i 23–25, 34, iii 11, 12, v 6, 7; for a less clear case of recognition, without however betrayal of the 'secret', cf. also ix 20). The thought in the mind of the Evangelist, as Wrede points out, is that the demons, as belonging to the supernatural world, have supernatural knowledge, and consequently recognize the supernatural character of the Christ *at a time when men did not.*

In the second place, passages are collected in which the Lord sternly enjoins secrecy, either upon the demoniacs (i 25, 34, iii 12), or, in the case of other sick persons who are healed, upon the patients or on their friends (i 43–45, v 43, vii 36, viii 26), or upon the disciples with regard to the Messiahship (viii 30, ix 9); to these Wrede adds two passages in which the Lord is represented as desirous of preserving secrecy as to His whereabouts (vii 24, ix 30), and a passage in which the injunction to keep silence proceeds not from our Lord but from the crowd (x 48).

Thirdly, there are a number of passages in which the Lord is represented as withdrawing from the crowd in order to give teaching of a more or less esoteric kind to the disciples, to whom it is granted to know *the mystery of the Kingdom of God* (iv 10–13, 33–34, vii 17–23, ix 28–29). To these are added, as further examples of teaching given privately to the disciples, such passages as ix 30–31, 33 sqq., xiii 3 sqq.

---

[1] It has been suggested that 'triumph over the sea-monster' was a 'favourite symbol' of 'victory over the power of death and the underworld' (cf. B. W. Bacon, *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 131, who refers to H. Schmidt, *Jona*, 1907).

[2] W. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (Göttingen, 1901).

The meaning of all these passages Wrede thinks is that the Messiahship of Jesus is a secret, and is meant to be kept as a secret, during His life on earth: no one except the Lord's chosen disciples is to know about it: only after the Resurrection is the veil removed. This is a fundamental conception in the mind of Mk.

But it is beset by certain historical difficulties, viz.:

(1) If the secret was continually being divulged by the demoniacs, how is it intelligible that it should remain unknown?

(2) The injunctions to maintain secrecy about the miraculous cures appear pointless in view of the manifest impossibility of concealing the facts, and the continual disobedience of the parties concerned (i 45, vii 36).

(3) If the secret was revealed to the disciples, and if in particular they were clearly informed beforehand about the Passion and Resurrection (viii 31, 32, ix 31, x 32–34, ix 9 sqq.), how came it that they were so taken aback by the fulfilment of the Lord's forewarnings that *they all left him, and fled* (xiv 50)?

To this last difficulty the Evangelist's own solution is that the disciples had not understood what Jesus meant (ix 10, 32); a representation which is in line with the picture of the disciples throughout the Gospel as betraying a remarkable dullness of apprehension from first to last (iv 13, 40, 41, vi 50–52, vii 18, viii 16–21, ix 5–6, x 24, xiv 37–41, and—if the words are directed against the disciples—ix 19). *Their heart,* as the Evangelist expresses it, *was hardened* (vi 52)—which perhaps means that a supernatural 'hardness' had come upon them, as in the case of the Pharaoh of the Exodus (Ex ix 12, cf. Is vi 9, 10).

Wrede's own conclusion from the data which he has assembled is that Mk's whole narrative is dominated by a group of fundamental conceptions which belong not to history, but to the history of Christian dogma. They may be summarized as follows:

(1) Jesus is the Messiah from the beginning, but He keeps His Messiahship a secret, so long as He remains on earth.

(2) He reveals Himself indeed to the disciples (though not to the people in general), but they are supernaturally prevented from understanding the revelation: it remains in their memory, but it remains inoperative until after the Resurrection.

On the other hand—

(1) The demons know Him, and betray their knowledge. They are bidden to hold their peace.

(2) The mighty acts of Jesus were also a disclosure of His supernatural character and mission to such as had eyes to see: for this reason those who were the subjects of them are enjoined to keep

them a secret. As a matter of fact the fame of Jesus as a wonder-worker could not be hid.

Taken as an historical picture this entire representation of the life of Jesus is beset with contradictions, and is unintelligible. The real fact is, according to Wrede, that before the Resurrection the idea that Jesus was, or might be, the Messiah had never occurred to any one. It is wholly a product of subsequent Christian theology, but when once it had arisen, then inevitably the attempt was made to interpret the life of Jesus as having been a Messianic life, a revelation and yet a concealment of the Messiah as He now appeared in the light of Christian faith; and the Marcan story, beset as it is with inner contradictions, is the result.

It is probable that the majority of unprejudiced readers will regard this theory of Wrede's, taken as a whole, as raising even more serious historical difficulties than those of the Gospel which it seeks to interpret. For a vigorous criticism of it from this point of view see W. Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, pp. 74 sqq. The Resurrection, taken thus in isolation from all that led up to it in the life and activity of Jesus, and regarded as virtually the sole foundation of Christianity, cannot possibly bear the weight of the superstructure erected upon it. Why, for example, upon Wrede's showing, should the vision of the Risen Lord, assuming it to be true that the disciples eventually saw Him in very deed alive from the dead (does Wrede grant this?), lead them of itself to the remarkable conclusion that He was the Messiah? Why should they infer from it more than simply the fact that He was alive? The Resurrection—as it is argued with complete force and cogency by J. Weiss in his posthumous book[1]—could only be interpreted as the vindication of a Messiahship already ascribed to Jesus during His lifetime: it could not give rise to the belief in His Messiahship *ab initio*.

Although, however, there are thus excellent reasons for rejecting the theory of Wrede, considered as a whole, it seems probable that in certain of his contentions, allowance being made for an over-emphatic rigidity of statement characteristic of their author,[2] there remains a residuum of truth. Thus:

(1) It seems likely that the reiterated recognitions of the Messiahship of Jesus ascribed to the demoniacs are the result, as Wrede suggests (at least as a *recurrent* phenomenon), of a theory in the mind of the Evangelist about demons and their supernatural knowledge.

(2) It is no doubt the case that in the light of the experiences of Easter and of Pentecost the disciples were changed men, and saw many things in the life and in the teaching of Jesus from a wholly new standpoint, and of this the Evangelist, as one who had been in

---

[1] Cf. J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 22.

[2] Wrede, as Dr. Sanday remarks, 'writes in the style of a Prussian official', and 'has all the arrogance of a certain kind of common sense'.

close touch with the Apostolic circle, could not fail to have been aware. On the other hand, he is no modern novelist, interested in characterization for its own sake, and concerned to track out and to portray the finer shades of psychological development. He knows only the broad contrast—before the Resurrection the disciples were as men spiritually blind: after the Resurrection they understood. It seems not impossible that Mk accounted for this fact, both to himself and to his readers, by assuming, as a theological theory, that the disciples' hearts were supernaturally 'hardened', and that this may account for a perhaps somewhat exaggerated emphasis throughout the Gospel on their persistent failure to understand, which to some readers has given the impression that they are credited with a really preternatural stupidity—an impression which in the subsequent Gospels of Mt and Lk is toned down.[1]

(3) It seems probable that in some cases an interpretation of our Lord's teaching which is really an application of it to the circumstances of the later Church, or which reflects the explanation of it current in Apostolic times, is introduced into the Gospel by means of the literary device of representing that the Lord explained it thus in private to the disciples (cf. iv 10 sqq., iv 34, vii 18 sqq., ix 28, 29).

(4) To the Evangelist it is probable that the miracles of Jesus were in some sense manifestations of His Messiahship, though to the Galilaeans at the time they would not, of course, have this significance, but would be merely such 'mighty works' as a great new prophet might be expected to perform. But the Evangelist is aware that the people of Galilee generally did not in fact regard Jesus as the Messiah (viii 27–28), and believes that it was not the desire of Jesus that He should be known to the general public in that capacity (viii 30). It is possible, therefore, that it was actually upon some such grounds as Wrede suggests that Mk conceived the Lord as having normally enjoined that the miracles should be kept secret: though he is at the same time sufficiently in touch with the facts of history to be well aware that it was largely by the rumour of Jesus' miraculous deeds that the multitudes were attracted. It is, indeed, part of the witness to Jesus that the mighty acts in which His power was manifested could not and did not remain concealed: and therefore Mk represents the injunctions of secrecy as being disobeyed—*the more he charged them, so much the more a great deal they published it. And they were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well* (vii 36–37).

On the other hand, (1) it is probable that our Lord, as a matter of history, did not desire to attract men's attention primarily in the capacity of a wonder-worker, and that both the attempt on His part to secure secrecy, and also the impossibility of doing so, are alike true to the historical situation. The Evangelist has simply generalized in the light of his general principles what was probably a *datum* of tradition in connexion with one or two episodes in particular: with the result that the injunction of secrecy tends to appear in the Gospel as the more or less stereotyped conclusion of any record of a miracle of healing, side by side with such statements as that *He could not be hid*, or that His injunctions of secrecy were disobeyed.

---

[1] Contrast, for example, Mk iv 13 with Mt xiii 51, and note the omission by Lk of such passages as Mk vi 52, viii 16–21.

(2) Since our Lord's own conception of the Messiahship was radically other than that which would be likely to be suggested by the term 'Messiah' in the popular mind, it is historically probable that His claim to be the Messiah was put forward, at least in public, only indirectly and with a certain amount of reserve. To this extent also the Marcan suggestion of a 'Messianic Secret', which the people generally were not to learn, though as a stereotyped theory it might easily be taken too rigidly, is not wholly without a basis of justification in the facts.

For a study of the psychology of the disciples involving a different interpretation of the 'dullness' ascribed to them in the Gospels from that of Wrede, see N. S. Talbot, *The Mind of the Disciples* (Macmillan, 1914). For the 'eschatological' interpretation of the 'Messianic Secret' cf. A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, pp. 328 sqq., and W. Sanday, *op. cit.*, pp. 77 sqq.; also a criticism by F. D. V. Narborough in the *Church Quarterly Review* for January 1922.

(7) *The Last Supper and the Crucifixion in relation to the Passover*

There appears at first sight to be a clear conflict of evidence between the Synoptic and the Johannine traditions with regard to the date of the Crucifixion in relation to the Passover. The death of our Lord, according to Jn xix 14, occurred on the *Preparation of the Passover*, i.e. on Nisan 14, and the *sabbath*, on which the bodies were not to remain on the cross, was no ordinary sabbath but a *high day* (Jn xix 31), i.e. it was *both* the sabbath day and *also* the first day of Unleavened Bread. On the other hand, according to Mk xiv 12, Lk xxii 7, the Last Supper appears to have coincided with the Paschal meal. The majority of scholars have thought it necessary to choose between the two views, and a considerable number of critical writers are disposed in this particular instance to give the preference to the Johannine tradition. Thus Prof. Burkitt, in an article contributed to the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April 1916,[1] writes that 'general considerations make against the theory that the Last Supper was a regular Paschal Meal. . . . Jesus was condemned and crucified by authority. The trial may have been irregular and unjust, but at least the pretence of law was observed; it was no mere assassination, or the result of a chance riot. This being the case, we can hardly imagine that the Jewish "High-Priests" who compassed Jesus' death would have thought the actual Festival-Day an appropriate time. They would be engaged with other duties. Either they would get the thing done before Passover began, or if they had Jesus arrested they would wait till the Feast was over. As a matter of fact, this view is actually echoed in the New Testament: "Not on the Feast-Day, lest there be a riot" is what Caiaphas and his advisers thought, according to Mk xiv 2; and Acts xii 4 tells us that when Herod had Peter in custody, though he had every intention of killing him and knew it would be a popular act, he nevertheless waited till Passover-time should come to an end. With regard to "Not on the Feast-Day" in Mk xiv 2, Wellhausen acutely remarks that the Evangelist probably judged the intention of the Jerusalemite Grandees *a posteriori*, from their actual performance, i. e. we may infer from the verse that the arrest of Jesus was actually accomplished before Passover arrived.

---

[1] F. C. Burkitt, 'The Last Supper and the Paschal Meal', *J. T. S.* xvii 291 sqq.

'With these general considerations agree many details in the Christian tradition. (1) S. Paul speaks of "Christ our Passover", i. e. (if we may press the phrase) our Lord died when the Paschal lambs were being killed. Some weight also must be given to the fact that when he speaks of the Last Supper he dates it as "the night when He was betrayed": had it been the Paschal meal it would have been more perspicuous to have said "at the last Passover". (2) The Johannine writings carefully avoid connecting the Supper with the Paschal meal, and in Jn xviii 28 and xix 14 it is definitely asserted that the Crucifixion took place before Passover-time. (3) The saying at the Supper peculiar to S. Luke ("With desire I have desired", Lk xxii 15–16) is at least equally interpretable on the theory that the Supper was not the Paschal meal, as that it was the meal.[1] (4) A good many features in Mk imply that the Feast had not begun at the time of the Crucifixion.'

Among such 'features' as Prof. Burkitt probably had in mind in writing the last-quoted sentence would be the visit to Gethsemane (see Ex xii 22), also the bearing of arms (Mk xiv 47), the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin (Mk xiv 53, xv 1), the coming of Simon of Cyrene *from the country* (Mk xv 21), on the assumption that the meaning is 'from work in the fields', the purchase of *linen cloth* for the entombment (Mk xv 46), and the actual burial by Jewish hands, all of which things, it is suggested, would be out of keeping with the character of a day which, according to Ex xii 16, was to be regarded (save in respect of necessary cooking) as the equivalent of a Sabbath. All these points are elaborately discussed and disposed of, with great wealth of learning but also (it may be) with a certain amount of special pleading, by Dalman in his latest book *Jesus-Jeschua.*[1]

---

[1] Prof. Burkitt had already argued in an earlier article (*J. T. S.* ix 569 sqq.) that the words imply that Jesus had much wished to eat the Passover of that year with the disciples, but after all would *not* be able to do so.

Dalman is convinced, in spite of all difficulties, that the Last Supper is to be understood as a Paschal meal. On the other hand, Wellhausen,[2] whose arguments are regarded by E. Meyer as being on this particular point 'quite decisive',[3] is equally convinced with Burkitt that it was not. W. C. Allen attempts a partial reconciliation. The words in Mk xiv 12 *on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover* must, he thinks, be corrupt. He suggests that originally the phrase may have run *before the day of unleavened bread*, &c., or alternatively (presupposing an Aramaic original) that there may be a mistranslation of a phrase which meant *in the days before.* Disregarding, accordingly, Mk's notes of time as being due either to corruption of the text, mistranslation from the Aramaic, or sheer confusion in the Evangelist's mind, Allen thinks that the rest of the story is intelligible as it stands in the Synoptists, and in no sense in conflict with the Johannine account. The room for the Last Supper is prepared as for the Passover, but a day, or even two days, in advance. Everything is ready except the lamb, which could not be obtained before the proper day, when the lambs were slaughtered officially in the Temple. But our Lord, being aware of Judas' treachery, does not wait for the lamb or for the proper day. He comes suddenly on the Thursday evening and sits down to a meal. 'The betrayer was with Him, so He was secure at least for a time from arrest. It was, of course, not a technical Passover meal, for there was no lamb. But there was bread, symbolizing Christ's body, and that was a sufficient substitute.'[4] G. H. Box holds a view substantially similar to Allen's, except that he dissociates the Last Supper rather more definitely from the Passover, and connects it with the Jewish ceremony known as *Qiddush*, i. e. the weekly 'Sanctification of the Sabbath', a ceremony which is thought to go back to pre-Christian times. The *Qiddush* ceremony consisted essentially in a solemn thanksgiving pronounced over a cup of wine by the head of the household at the conclusion of a meal which began early on Friday afternoon and was so timed as to end at the beginning of the Sabbath (i. e. about 6 p.m.). The most ancient wording of the formula for the 'Sanctification of the Day' appears to have been 'Blessed be He who has sanctified the Sabbath Day'. Dr. Box thinks that our Lord had been always accustomed to observe this weekly ceremony with His disciples, and that the Preparation Day of Passover (*sc.* Nisan 14) was treated as a Sabbath.

---

[1] G. Dalman, *op. cit.*, pp. 86 sqq.

[2] Wellhausen, *Einleitung* (ed. 2), pp. 130 sqq.

[3] E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge* i 169.

[4] Allen on Mk xiv 12: cf. the same writer on *S. Matthew* in I. C. C., pp. 270 sqq.

The *Qiddush* meal consequently was on this occasion put back one day (*sc.* from Friday to Thursday afternoon).[1]

A more definitely reconciling view than any of these was suggested as long ago as 1892 by D. Chwolson.[2] Chwolson's starting-point is the phrase of Lev xxiii 5, Ex xii 6, Num ix 3, *between the two evenings* (R.V. mg.). The ruling interpretation of this in later times was that it could be taken to mean any time in the afternoon. Chwolson argues that in the time of our Lord it was taken strictly, and signified 'during the period of evening twilight', i. e. immediately after sunset. If now the first day of Unleavened Bread coincided with a Sabbath, it could be argued that the preparation of the Paschal lambs would be an infringement of the Sabbath Day, since there would not be time to roast the lambs before the Sabbath began. The maxim ascribed to Hillel, viz. 'The Passover displaces the Sabbath', Chwolson regards as a Pharisaic opinion which was not admitted by the Sadducaean hierarchy who controlled the Temple. Accordingly he suggests that when the first day of Unleavened Bread fell on a Sabbath, the slaughter of the lambs, which should properly have taken place on Friday at sundown, was put back to Thursday at sundown. The slaughter of the lambs being thus anticipated by a day, there would be two opinions as to the proper night for eating them. The Pharisaic opinion, which Chwolson supposes our Lord and His disciples to have followed, was to the effect that the lambs must be eaten on the same evening on which they were slaughtered. The Sadducaean opinion, followed by the hierarchy (Jn xviii 28), was that the lambs must still be eaten on the strict legal day, i. e. on the evening which followed Nisan 14. In the year of the Crucifixion the Preparation of the Passover fell on a Friday, the first day of Unleavened Bread coinciding with the Sabbath. The lambs were accordingly slaughtered on the *Thursday* evening, and our Lord and His disciples ate their Passover the same night, though without the customary unleavened bread, since the feast of Unleavened Bread had not yet begun.

Strack and Billerbeck present a modification of Chwolson's view.[3] His fundamental thesis with regard to the strict interpretation of the phrase *between the two evenings* in the time of our Lord they regard as disproved by the contemporary evidence of Philo, who expressly refers to the slaughter of the Paschal lambs as beginning about mid-day. They suggest, however, that the solution of the puzzle is to be found in a dispute between the Pharisees and the 'sons of Boethus', a Sadducaean family who between the years

---

[1] G. H. Box, 'The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist', *J. T. S.* iii 357 sqq.; also a more recent article, 'The Jewish Background of the Institution of the Eucharist', in *The Jewish Guardian* for Dec. 7, 1923: and for further discussion of the *Qiddush* ceremony cf. Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp. 374 sqq.

[2] Chwolson, *Das letzte Passamahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes.*

[3] *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch* ii, pp. 846 sqq.

24 B.C. and A.D. 65 held the High Priesthood, as to the proper interpretation of Lev xxiii 9 sqq. The latter held that the firstfruits offering must always be made on the first day after the Sabbath which fell in the Feast of Unleavened Bread, i. e. always on a Sunday. The Pharisees maintained that the offering in question should be made, irrespective of the day of the week, on the second day of Unleavened Bread, since the first day of that feast counted for religious purposes as a Sabbath. The beginning of the month Nisan (which inaugurated the ecclesiastical year: Ex xii 2) was fixed by observation of the moon, and determined officially by a Calendar Commission controlled by the Sanhedrin. Strack and Billerbeck produce evidence that disputes occasionally arose as to whether the official determination of the date of the new moon was strictly correct, more particularly in connexion with its bearing on the position of Nisan 14 relatively to the Sabbath. The house of Boethus, in the interests of their interpretation of Lev xxiii 9 sqq., were anxious, if possible, to secure that Nisan 15 should fall upon a Sabbath. It is suggested that in the year of the Crucifixion this was effected by means of a corrupt understanding with the Calendar Commission, but that the Pharisaic party raised objections, and maintained that the month really began a day earlier. The result was a compromise, according to which the official reckoning of the Calendar Commission was maintained for official purposes, but it was conceded that the Pharisaic party might, if they wished, keep the Passover on the day which, according to *their* reckoning, was the right one. Our Lord and His disciples will have sided with the Pharisaic party, whereas the Priesthood and the majority of the Sanhedrin kept the official day, even the Pharisaic members of the latter body perhaps dropping their scruples and being content to accept the official reckoning to the extent of being willing to take part in the trial of Jesus.

It should be added that the apparent divergence between the Synoptic and the Johannine traditions assumed in the second century a certain importance in connexion with the so-called Quartodeciman controversy. The Eastern Churches, relying upon the Johannine tradition, were accustomed to celebrate the anniversary of the Lord's death as the Christian Passover on the 14th Nisan (i. e. on the same date as the Jewish Passover, irrespective of the day of the week on which it fell). The Roman Church regarded the Jewish Passover as having been replaced by the Christian Eucharist, which was kept upon Easter Sunday, the Friday before it being observed as the commemoration of the Passion, irrespective of the day of the week on which Nisan 14 happened to fall. Those who regard themselves as bound to choose definitely as between the Synoptic and the Johannine traditions commonly regard the one which they discard as unhistorical, as having been influenced either by Quartodeciman or by anti-Quartodeciman symbolism, as the case may be: that is to say, it is maintained either that the Fourth Gospel has adapted the story for symbolic purposes so as to make the date of our Lord's death coincide with the time at which the Paschal lambs were slain, or, conversely, that Mk has erroneously described the Last Supper as a Paschal meal in the interests of the view that the true Christian Passover is the Eucharist.

(8) *Mk* xvi 7–8 *and the lost Ending of the Gospel*

The problem of the lost ending of Mk has recently been elaborately discussed by B. H. Streeter in *The Four Gospels*, pp. 335 sqq. Apart from the fact that the continuation printed in English Bibles as xvi 9–20 is manifestly non-Marcan in character (it appears to be a *résumé* based for the most part on the writings of S. Luke—see notes *ad loc.*), the evidence of textual criticism alone would be sufficient to establish with certainty the conclusion that the authentic text breaks off after xvi 8. It is at this point that the Gospel ends in the two oldest and best Greek MSS., ℵ and B. It is stated by Eusebius, *c.* 325, that the Gospel, in the oldest and best MSS. which he knew, ended with the words *for they were afraid.* The Gospel ends at the same point in the Syro-Sinaitic palimpsest, in the oldest MS. of the Georgian version, and in three of the oldest MSS. of the Armenian version: a fourth very early Armenian MS. has the last twelve verses separated from the body of the Gospel by a note which says that they are by 'the presbyter Ariston'. Other early MSS. and versions contain the so-called 'Shorter Ending' (see p. 248), either in the text or in the margin, in some cases followed by the more usual 'Longer Ending', introduced by the words 'This also is current'. Since, as Streeter remarks, 'the Shorter Conclusion is evidently an attempt by some early editor to heal the gaping wound, the MSS. and versions which contain it really afford additional evidence' that the text actually ended at xvi 8. The conclusion that verses 9–20 are not by S. Mark is in fact so compelling that it is frankly accepted by the Roman Catholic scholar Lagrange, who decides that the passage, though 'canonically authentic' (i.e. it is received as part of the canon of Scripture by the Church), is nevertheless not authentic in a *literary* sense—the author is some one other than S. Mark. Canon Streeter, who, in the volume to which reference has been made, has succeeded in establishing with considerable probability the local *provenance* of the various types of textual tradition which have come down to us, sums up his discussion of the MS. evidence with regard to the conclusion of Mk by saying that 'the distribution of the MSS. and versions, taken in connexion with the statement of Eusebius, compels us to assume that the Gospel ended here'—i.e. at xvi 8—'in the first copies that reached Africa, Alexandria, Caesarea, and Antioch. Since in all probability the African text originally came from Rome, the burden of proof lies on the person who would argue that it was not also missing from the most ancient Roman text.'

How are the facts to be explained? A few scholars—e. g. Wellhausen and E. Meyer—think that little or no explanation is required. In their judgement the Gospel is complete as it stands—it was always intended to end with the flight of the women from the tomb, the Resurrection being hinted at but not directly described. According to Meyer, it was in Mk's view a mystery too sacred to be committed to writing.[1] But could the sentence *for they were afraid*, on any reasonable view, be originally meant as the conclusion of a book? Are the words even the conclusion of a sentence? Mk x 32 is quoted as a possible parallel: but it is more likely that the sentence breaks off in the middle, and that the verb either required an object (e.g. 'they were afraid of the Jews'), or (more probably) was followed by a clause like 'until they reached the disciples', or (as Streeter conjectures) 'lest they should be thought mad'. It appears in any case to be virtually certain that Mk must have intended to chronicle an appearance of the Risen Lord to S. Peter, and probably other appearances as well.

How then did the Gospel come to be mutilated? The mutilation must, in any case, as we have seen, have been very early. It is suggested by Streeter that the end of the roll on which the original autograph was written must have been torn off before any copies had got into circulation. 'How . . . the damage occurred it is useless to speculate. At Rome in Nero's days a variety of "accidents" were by way of occurring to Christians and their possessions.' What appears to be certain is that the loss was a primitive one. The alternative theory suggested by Burkitt in *Two Lectures on the Gospels*, pp. 33 sqq., according to which the Gospel, being supplanted by Mt and Lk, for a time dropped out of use, until at length only one copy—and that a torn one—survived, is effectively refuted by Streeter.[2] For the theory of a deliberate mutilation on the ground of a supposed dislike of the contents of the lost ending on the part of the Church there is still less to be said. It appears almost certain that the lost ending was unknown to S. Luke, who shows himself acquainted with the Gospel up to xvi 8, edits the angelic message containing the apparent injunction to go to Galilee so as to convert it into a reference to words spoken in Galilee (Lk xxiv 6), and then continues with the tradition of appearances of the Risen Lord in Jerusalem and in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. The inference is that he was puzzled—as we are puzzled to-day—by the reference to Galilee, but that he knew nothing of the sequel, in which it was presumably made clear. It is not infrequently suggested that the substance of Mk's lost ending is preserved in Mt xxviii, which tells of an appearance to the two Maries (Mt xxviii 9–10) and of a subsequent appearance in Galilee to the eleven (Mt xxviii 16–20). Both Streeter,[3] however, and Burkitt[4] have argued strongly against this.

---

[1] E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge* i, p. 18.

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 339 sqq.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 343.

[4] F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, p. 83.

The former points especially to the absence of any record in Mt of an appearance to S. Peter, and also to the fact that Mt's narrative 'becomes exceptionally vague at the exact point where the authentic text of Mk now ends'. The latter similarly writes: 'The whole of Mt xxviii 9–20, except the paragraph which finishes up the story of the guards (a story foreign to Mk), appears to me to be Matthew's peroration, added to round off by a suitable conclusion the mutilated narrative of the Second Gospel.'

But if the lost ending was unknown to the authors of Mt and Lk, is it likely that its contents have survived anywhere else? Two suggestions have been made: the first, that the lost ending was known to, and used by, the author of the apocryphal *Gospel of Peter*, the recovered fragment of which is apparently leading up to an appearance of the Risen Lord to a group of disciples, of whom Peter (the supposed narrator) is one, as they were fishing by the Lake side in Galilee—to such an appearance, in short, as is described in Jn xxi.[1] From the results, however, of a critical examination of Pseudo-Peter undertaken by C. H. Turner in the *J. T. S.* for January 1913, it would appear that for Pseudo-Peter also the text of Mk ended at Mk xvi 8, and since he shows clear signs elsewhere of dependence on Jn, it must be presumed that it was from Jn xxi, and not from the lost end of Mk, that he derived the idea of a Christophany by the Lake.[2] The other suggestion is that which has been tentatively made by Canon Streeter, viz. that the account in Jn xxi may itself have been based on the lost end of Mk. He suggests either that a single unmutilated copy of Mk had reached Ephesus and had there been preserved, or alternatively that Mk had visited Ephesus in the course of S. Paul's imprisonment at Rome—cf. Col iv 10 for a contemplated visit of Mk to Asia, 2 Tim iv 11 for his recall—and had there communicated to the Church his account of the Resurrection appearances, which had survived locally as an oral tradition.[3] Streeter does not claim for this hypothesis that it is more than 'scientific guessing', and it appears to me to be improbable. The theory subsequently suggested that Jn xxi is the work of the author of Jn i–xx (i. e. on Streeter's view, with which I personally agree, of John the Presbyter), intended partly to reconcile the two traditions (Galilee and Jerusalem) as to the locality of the Resurrection appearances, and partly to mitigate for the Ephesian Church the shock of the approaching death before the Parousia of John the Presbyter, by explaining that the Saviour had not really promised survival until the Parousia to 'the beloved disciple' (i. e. John the Apostle),[4] appears to me to be quite fanciful. Chapter xxi of the

---

[1] For the passage in Pseudo-Peter see M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 93–94: Gk. text in E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, p. 20.

[2] C. H. Turner, 'The Gospel of Peter', in *J. T. S.*, vol. xiv, pp. 182 sqq.

[3] B. H. Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 352 sqq.

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 471 sqq.

Fourth Gospel is surely an appendix added by those who had already identified the author of the Gospel with the Beloved Disciple, and probably written after that author's death. If it is based (as is probable) on literary rather than traditional sources, they are probably to be found in a combination of data supplied by Mt xxviii 16–20 with Lk v 1–10.

Our conclusion is that the contents of the lost ending of Mk have not anywhere survived: which makes it probable that they never existed—that the Gospel was unfinished. The author broke off in the middle of a sentence, and never resumed. Did he die? Was he suddenly arrested and martyred? Or did he leave Rome, where he was working, and for some reason never return? We have no data for answering these questions, but at least it is probable that even if the original autograph of the Gospel were damaged or torn, the missing portion would surely have been restored by the author himself, had he been living and accessible.

The result is that we are left to conjecture what the missing conclusion would have been. It is commonly supposed, on the basis of Mk xvi 7, that the sequel would have chronicled an initial appearance of the Risen Christ *to the disciples* in Galilee: and so the Evangelist Mt seems to have inferred (Mt xxviii 16–20). But it is not absolutely certain. The disciples clearly are not already in Galilee: it is implied that they are still in Jerusalem. The 'scattering' of the 'sheep', therefore, when the Shepherd was smitten (Mk xiv 27), referred only to their scattering from the Garden of Gethsemane, and not to their scattering from Jerusalem. The further saying *Howbeit, after I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee* (xiv 28), taken strictly, ought to mean 'I will precede', 'I will walk at your head, and lead you into Galilee'—cf. x 32.[1] It is true that Mk himself seems to understand the saying as pointing to an appearance of the Risen Lord in Galilee, since he represents the angel at the tomb as recalling it with the addition of the words *There shall ye see him* (Mk xvi 7). But it is at least possible that this 'Marcan parenthesis' is the result, as J. Weiss has suggested, of a misunderstanding of the saying on the part of Mk.[2] Moreover, the women do not, according to Mk, deliver the message (xvi 8). No doubt the Evangelist would not, even as the result of a misunderstanding, have interpreted the saying about Galilee by the addition of the words *There shall ye see him* if he had not been acquainted with *some* tradition of appearances of the Risen Lord in Galilee, but it is by no means certain that he thought of them as being the first. J. Weiss, who is of opinion that the anticipated return of the Lord and of His disciples to Galilee never took place, thinks that the saying of Mk xiv 28, xvi 7 is to be regarded for that very reason as belonging to a very ancient and historical tradition. 'Whether or not it is a genuine saying of Jesus, it reflects an expectation on the part of the disciples which was disappointed: the Lord did not lead them back to Galilee.'

---

[1] C. H. Turner, *The Study of the New Testament: An Inaugural Lecture*, p. 62.

[2] J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 12.

In point of fact, the difficulties involved in the belief that the earliest appearance of the Risen Lord took place in Galilee are very serious. They have recently been forcibly pointed out by Prof. Burkitt, who draws attention, in the first place, to the fact that Galilee did not become a Christian country—'the historical result of the Passion and Crucifixion was that Peter and His companions settled down at Jerusalem'. 'The documents that tell us of appearances in Galilee say nothing about returning to Jerusalem.'[1] We have to choose, Prof. Burkitt thinks, between (1) the view which 'seems to be indicated in Mark' (though 'after all it is not quite certain what Mark went on to narrate'), and which is 'actually set forth in Matthew', and (2) the view of the Lucan writings, viz. 'that Peter and the little nucleus of believers never got more than a day's journey from Jerusalem between the Crucifixion of Jesus and the Feast of Pentecost'—a view which, as Burkitt truly remarks, is 'psychologically more probable' than the other, and which explains better the rise of the early Jerusalem Church. It is a question of the credit of Luke as an historian, and of the historical value of the opening chapters of Acts. Lk certainly believed that the disciples stayed in Jerusalem, and that they did so by the express injunction of the Lord (Lk xxiv 49, Acts i 4).

I incline personally to think that there is some substance behind the Galilee tradition, but nevertheless that the Lucan view in the main is right. In the wider sense of the term 'disciples', the Lord had many disciples in Galilee, who may well have gone back there after the Passover week was ended. Appearances may have taken place both in Galilee and in Jerusalem, but not to the same people: the Apostles and other more immediate disciples of the Lord will have stayed in Jerusalem.[2] Traditions survived in the Church of Christophanies both in Jerusalem and in Galilee, and inasmuch as there was a natural tendency to overlook the possibility of different groups of our Lord's followers being in different places, to think vaguely of 'the disciples' as moving about always together as a company, and to understand by 'the disciples' S. Peter and the rest, it is easy to conceive that when it was rumoured or reported that the Lord had been seen, not only in Jerusalem, but in Galilee, it was at once assumed that the people who saw Him there must have been the Apostles: and consequently that they must have left Jerusalem and gone into Galilee: a procedure so strange that it could only be explained as being due to a specific command or a deliberate word of the Lord Jesus Himself.

---

[1] F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, pp. 84, 86.

[2] An alternative view would be that (despite Lk xxiv 49, Acts i 4) the Apostles, after seeing the Risen Lord in Jerusalem, returned for a while to Galilee, until the next Jewish Festival (Pentecost) brought them once more to the Holy City.

INDICES

I

INDEX OF AUTHORS

Abbott, E. A., xxxvi, 83, 86, 104, 166.
Abrahams, I., lix, 10, 16, 26, 28 sq., 34 sq., 47, 77, 107, 135, 138, 141, 156, 166, 168, 170 sq., 218, 226.
Acta Joannis, 144.
Acts of Pilate, 69, 234.
Aeschylus, 21.
Allen, W. C., xxix sq., xxxiii, lviii, 22, 28 sq., 40, 52 sqq., 58, 71, 89, 94, 101, 104, 120, 130, 142, 183, 200, 228, 251, 264.
Apocalypse of Peter, 117.
Aristophanes, 209.
Aristotle, 10, 176.
Assumption of Moses, 117.
Augustine, xxv, 86, 99.

Bacon, B. W., xxv, xxviii, xliv, lviii, lix, 12, 19, 33 sq., 39, 50, 54, 59, 64 sq., 68, 70, 78, 86, 90, 94, 99 sqq., 104, 106, 123, 130, 144 sq., 150 sq., 191, 197, 199, 206, 234, 238, 250, 258.
Barnabas, Epistle of, 166, 175, 188.
Bartlet, J. V., xxx, lviii, 243, 247, 249.
Batiffol, P., 85, 205.
Baudissin, W. W. von, 35.
Bennett, W. H., 35.
Bernard, J. H., 144.
Bertram, G., 207.
Bethune-Baker, J. F., 252.
Bevan, A. A., 12.
Blass, F., xxxiii, 57.
Bonnet, M., 144.
Bousset, W., lix, 118, 146 sq., 153, 173 sq., 188, 192, 220 sq.
Box, G. H., 6, 264 sq.
Box, G. H., and Gore, C., 185.
Brandt, W., 220, 228.
Browne, E. G., 12.
Bultmann, R., xiv sq., lix.
Burkitt, F. C., xviii, xxi, xxxv, lix, 37, 98, 132, 135 sq., 162, 216, 228, 244, 255, 262 sq., 268 sq., 271.
Burney, C. F., 176.

Cadman, W. H., 98, 113, 114.
Celsus, 74.
Chapman, J., xxix.
Charles, R. H., xlviii, liv, lix, 10, 118, 134 sq., 144, 168 sq., 181.
Chase, F. H., 174, 212, 253.
Cheyne, T. K., 9.
Cheyne, T. K., and Black, J. Sutherland, lix.
Chrysostom, xxviii.
Chwolson, D., 217 sq., 265.
Clark, A. C., xxxiv, 40, 228.
Clement of Alexandria, xxviii, 117, 140.
Clement of Rome, xvii, xlv, 248.
Collingwood, R. G., xxii.
Crum, J. M. C., 215 sq.
Cumont, F., 65.
Cyril of Alexandria, 141.

Dalman, G., lix, 41, 55, 64, 149, 151, 153, 166, 175, 192, 200, 204 sqq., 222, 242, 264.
Danby, H., 217 sqq.
Deissmann, A., xxxi, 6, 77, 102, 227, 232, 240, 250.
Demosthenes, 10.
Dibelius, M., xiv, lix.
Didache, 30, 78, 166.
Dill, S., 76.
Dittenberger, G., 108.
Dobschütz, E. von, 181.
Dostoevsky, F., 253.
Duhm, B., 162.

Easton, B. S., 50.
Edersheim, A., lix, 156, 237.
Epictetus, 256.
Epiphanius, 75.
Eusebius, xii, xxv sq., xxviii, xxx, 69, 117, 188, 241, 246 sq.

Frazer, J. G., 229.
Friedländer, M., 188.

Georgius Hamartolus, 144.
Glover, T. R., 72, 99, 113, 236.
Goguel, M., xiii, xv, lix.
Gore, C., 154, 164, 178, 180, 193.
Gospel according to the Hebrews, 36, 139, 238, 251 sq.
Gospel of Peter, xxiv, 117, 215, 238, 244, 247, 269.
Gospel of the Infancy, 234.
Gospel of Thomas, 74.
Gould, E. P., lviii, 124, 256.
Grenfell and Hunt, xxxi.
Grenfell, Hunt, and Smyly, xxxi.
Gunkel, H., 187.
Guy, D. S., 204.

Hadfield, J. A., 65.
Hannay, J. O., xlvii sq.
Harnack, A. von, xxix sq., xlviii, 6, 12, 65, 145, 251.
Hastings, J., lix.
Hawkins, Sir J. C., xxxv, xxxvii sq., lix, 130.
Headlam, A. C., xix.
Helvidius, 75.
Herford, R. T., 29.
Hermas, xxiv.
Hilary, 74, 86.
Hippolytus, xxvii.
History of Susanna, 221.
Holland, H. S., xx.
Holtzmann, H. J., lviii, 75, 153, 191, 194, 250, 256.
Horace, xxi, 198.
Hort, Sir A. F., 247.
Hoskyns, E. C., 156.
Huck, A., xvi.
Husband, R. W., 219.

Ignatius of Antioch, 33.
Innes, J. Taylor, 217 sq.
Irenaeus, xxiv, xxvii, xxix, 5, 232, 246 sq.

James, M. R., 117, 144, 154, 208, 215, 244, 269.
James, W., 119.
Jerome, 36, 75, 142, 144, 192, 228, 233, 238, 241, 247, 249, 252.
Josephus, xxxix, 10, 36, 38, 41, 64 sq., 80 sqq., 89, 94 sq., 156, 165, 167, 176 sq., 182, 218 sq., 222, 229, 230, 240.
Jülicher, A., 48, 57, 161.
Justin Martyr, xviii, 74, 120, 174, 186, 246 sq.
Juvenal, 87, 94, 209.

Kautzsch, E., 9.
Keim, Th., xix.
Kennett, R. H., 204.
Kenyon, F. G., xxxiv.
Klostermann, E., lviii, 108, 134 sq., 144, 211 sq., 250, 256.

Lagrange, M.-J., xxxiii, xlvii, lviii, 20, 26, 33, 55, 61, 65, 68 sq., 72, 78, 127, 130, 154 sq., 162, 176, 186, 191, 214, 230, 235, 250, 267.
Lake, K., xxxiv, 157, 240, 243.
Latham, H., 89.
Lebreton, J., 193.
Le Camus, J., 61.
Liberty, S., 219, 253.
Lightfoot, J. B., 230.
Livy, 227.
Lock, W., 83.
Loisy, A., xliv, lviii, 15, 19, 25, 49 sqq., 61, 64, 79, 83, 88, 99, 109, 117 sq., 127, 129 sq., 137, 142, 147, 153, 158, 161 sq., 169, 182, 199, 202, 209, 222, 230, 235 sq., 240, 252.
Lowrie, W., 87.
Lucian, 26, 28.

Martyrium Polycarpi, 145, 215.
Mayo, C. H., 209.
McNeile, A. H., 40, 188, 228, 257.
Menzies, A., xv, lviii, 11, 26, 50, 141, 191, 196, 212, 224, 228, 233 sq., 236, 256.
Merrill, E. T., xvii.
Meyer, E., xxxviii, xlii sq., lix, 127, 151, 220, 227, 239, 264, 268.
Micklem, E. R., 25.
Milligan, G., xxxi.
Minucius Felix, 247.
Moberly, W. H., 252.
Moffatt, J., 230.
Montefiore, C. G., xliv, lviii, 26, 29, 73, 77, 96, 99, 213, 250.
Moulton, J. H., xxxiii.
Moulton, J. H., and Milligan, G., xxxi, lix, 83, 145, 212, 224, 230, 237.
Moulton, W. F., and Geden, A. S., lix.
Muratorianum, xxvii.

Narborough, F. D. V., 262.
Nevius, J. L., xlix.
Norden, E., 220.

Oesterley, W. O. E., 29.
Oesterley, W. O. E., and Box, G. H., lix, 10, 26, 29, 47, 120, 171, 175, 265.
Origen, 5, 64, 72, 74 sq., 235.

Pallis, A., 9, 82, 121, 224, 256 sq.
Papias, xii, xvi, xxv sqq., 144, 246 sq.

Pausanias, 29.
Peregrinatio Silviae, 152.
Pfleiderer, O., 197.
Philip of Sidé, 144.
Philo, 225, 229.
Pliny, 198, 233.
Polybius, xxxi, 238.
Polycarp, 186.
Polycrates of Ephesus, xxx.
Preuschen, E., 117, 198, 208, 215, 244, 269.

Rashdall, H., 146.
Reich, H., 230.
Reinach, S., 229.
Reitzenstein, R., 15, 23, 128.
Resch, A., xli.
Rihbany, A. M., 138.
Robinson, J. A., 10, 36.
Rohde, E., 17.

Sanday, W., xx, xxxv sq., xlii, lix, 17, 48, 65, 89, 105, 182, 201, 205, 230, 233, 260, 262.
Schmidt, H., 258.
Schmidt, K. L., xiv, xxi, lx.
Schmiedel, P. W., 236.
Schürer, E., lix, 16, 33, 35, 65 sq., 81, 94, 112, 130, 166, 177, 185, 213, 237.
Schwartz, E., 154, 191.
Schweitzer, A., xx, lx, 77, 147, 151, 180, 199, 262.
Scott, E. F., 147.
Simkhovitch, V. G., 165.
Smith, Sir G. A., lix, 17, 89, 112, 252.
Stanton, V. H., xxxvi, xlii, lx, 34, 182.
Strack, H. L., and Billerbeck, P., lviii, 10, 95, 141, 158, 160, 165, 177, 184, 209, 222, 265 sq.
Streeter, B. H., xii sqq., xvii sq., xxi, xxiv, xxvii sq., xxx sq., xxxiv–xl, xlii, li, lx, 9, 14, 22, 32, 42 sq., 47 sq., 65, 166, 181 sq., 222, 228, 246, 248 sq., 257, 267 sqq.
Swete, H. B., lviii, 29, 44, 89 sq., 105, 130, 141, 201, 211, 224, 244, 250.
Symonds, J. A., 71.

Tacitus, xvi sq., 102, 178.
Talbot, N. S., 262.
Tatian, xxiv, 246.
Taylor, Jeremy, 158.
Tertullian, 75, 117, 144, 186, 247.
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 170.
Thackeray, H. St. J., 10.
Theophrastus, 233.
Theophylact, 224.
Thompson, J. M., xvi.
Trench, R. C., 86.
Turner, C. H., xxiv, xxxii, 32, 38 sq., 57, 108, 121, 142 sq., 195, 237, 240, 242 sqq., 269 sq.

Underhill, E., 118 sq.

Vergil, 188, 235.
Volkmar, G., xliii sq.

Weinel, H., xlviii, 186.
Weiss, B., xl sq., lviii, 77, 236, 256.
Weiss, J., xiii sq., xviii, xxii, xxix sqq., xli, li sqq., lviii, lx, 4, 19, 30 sq., 41, 53, 56, 59, 76 sq., 108, 115, 119, 127, 137, 145, 151, 154, 157 sq., 172, 174, 180, 182, 185 sq., 188, 192, 202, 213, 221, 236, 238, 250, 252, 256, 260, 270.
Wellhausen, J., xxx, xxxiii, xxxviii, lviii, lx, 13, 25 sq., 29, 31 sq., 34, 43, 45, 48, 51, 53, 64 sq., 71, 76, 96, 101, 108, 117, 121, 132, 134 sq., 140 sq., 145 sqq., 169, 183, 191, 195, 201, 220, 222, 239, 250, 264, 268.
Wendland, P., 65, 76, 102.
Wendling, E., xxxvi, xli sq., lx.
Werner, M., xliv sq., lx.
Westcott, B. F., and Hort, F. J. A., xxxiv.
Williams, J. Lukyn, 60.
Williams, N. P., xxxvi, xlii, 85.
Windisch, H., l.
Wohlenberg, G., lviii.
Wood, H. G., xxii, lviii, 48, 59, 107, 112, 124, 134, 139, 143, 154, 158, 165, 211 sq., 236, 256.
Wrede, W., lx, 66, 258 sqq.
Wright, A., 199.

Xenophon, xviii.

Zahn, Th., xxvi.
Zwaan, J. de, 212.

II

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Agape, the, 85.
Anointing, 78.
  at Bethany, the, 195 sqq.
  with the Spirit, 11, 254.
Antichrist, xxix, 181, 186 sqq.
Apocalyptic Discourse, xlii, 177 sqq.
Apostles, 39, 83.
Arrest of Jesus, the, 213 sqq.
Authority, the Messianic, 11, 15 sq., 34, 159 sq., 254.
Authorship of the Gospel, xxiv sqq.

Baptism, Christian, lvi, 7, 11.
  of infants, 128, 137.
  of Jesus, 9 sqq., 251 sqq.
Baptist, John the, 4 sqq., 30 sq., 79 sqq., 120 sq., 159 sq.
Barabbas, the Choice of, 226 sqq.
Bartimaeus, 148 sq.
Bath Qol, 10 sq., 118.
Beelzebub Controversy, xxxix, 43.
Beloved Son, 10, 120.
Blind Man of Bethsaida, the, 107 sq.
Bride-chamber, Sons of the, 31, 256 sq.
Burial of Jesus, the, 240 sqq.

Caesarea Philippi, 111 sqq.
Children, Blessing of the, 136 sq.
Commandment, the Greatest, 169 sqq.
Conflict, stories of, xiv, 21, 98.
Criticism of the Gospel, the, xxxv sqq.
Cross, Doctrine of the, xliii sq., lii, 108 sqq., 113
Crucifixion, the, 231 sqq.

Date of the Gospel, xxiv sqq.
David's Son and David's Lord, li, 172 sqq.
Deaf-Mute, the, 100 sqq.
Death of Jesus, the, 234 sqq.
Demand for a Sign, the, 105.
Demonology, xlvii sqq., 16, 18, 38, 61 sq., 63 sqq., 100, 102, 124 sq., 258 sqq.
Denial, S. Peter's, xxix, 207 sqq., 223 sqq.
Divorce, 133 sqq.
'Doublets' in the Gospel, xiv sq., xxxvii, xlii, 85, 103.

Elijah, 117 sqq., 120 sqq., 237, 253 sqq.
Empty Grave, Discovery of the, 242 sqq.
Ending of the Gospel,
  the Lost, xxxviii, 267 sqq.
  the Longer, 245 sqq.
  the Shorter, 248.
Epileptic Boy, the, 122 sqq.
Eucharist, the, 85, 87, 104, 106, 204 sqq., 257 sq.
Exorcism, xlix sq., 15 sqq., 18, 43, 61 sq., 63 sqq., 77, 124 sq., 128 sq., 247.
Exorcist who was not a Disciple, the, xliii, 128 sqq.

Faith, 62, 68, 124, 149, 158.
Fasting, 30 sq., 125.
Feeding of the Multitude, 84 sqq., 103 sqq.
Fig-tree, the Barren, xliii sqq., 153 sqq.
Forgiveness, 23 sqq., 158 sq.
Freer *Logion*, the, 248 sq.

Gehenna, 130 sq.
Gentiles, Mission of Christianity to the, xlii sqq., 86, 98 sq., 103 sq.
Gethsemane, 209 sqq.
Gospel, 3, 6, 8, 13 sq., 141 sq., 198, 251.
  authorship of the, xxiv sqq.
  as a form of literature, xviii sqq.
  criticism of the, xxxv sqq.
  date of the, xxiv sqq.
  earliest written, the, xv sqq.
  ending of the, 245 sqq.
  historical value of the, xxii sqq.
  language and style of the, xxxi sqq.
  neither a Memoir nor a Biography, xviii sqq.
  not a translation, xxxiii sq.
  not distinctively Pauline, xliii sqq.
  religious value of the, liv sqq.
  supernatural element in the, xlvi sqq.
  theology of the, l sqq.
Greatness, the true, 126 sqq.
Greek, knowledge of, in Palestine, 41, 100.

Herod, attitude of, 78 sq.
Herodians, 36, 106.
Husbandmen, the Wicked, 160 sqq.

Jaïrus' daughter, 66 sq., 69 sqq.
Journey to Judaea, the, xvii, xx, 131 sqq.
Judas, the treachery of, 198 sq.

Kingdom of God, the, liii, 13, 48, 56, 58, 130, 136 sq., 138, 140 sq., 171 sq.

Language, Style, Vocabulary, and Text of the Gospel, xxxi sqq.
Last Supper, the, 194, 202 sqq., 262 sqq.
Law, attitude of Jesus towards the, 20 sqq., 92 sqq., 170 sqq.
Legion of demons, the, 62 sqq.
Leper, the, 20 sqq., 256.
Levi, 27 sq.
Lord, as a title of Jesus, li, 6, 8, 22, 64, 100, 152, 173 sqq.
Lord's Prayer, the, 158 sq., 211 sq.

Magic, 17, 102, 128.
Marcan Hypothesis, the, xix sqq.
Mark, John of Jerusalem, xvi, xxx sq., 201, 215 sq.
Martyrdom, xvii, lii, 108 sqq., 144 sq., 147.
Messianic authority, 11, 15 sq., 34, 159 sq., 254.
  claim, 24, 34, 150 sqq., 156, 160 sqq., 222.
  secret, lii sq., 149, 197, 258 sqq.
  vocation, 253 sqq.
Miracles, xlvi sqq., 59 sq., 85, 154, 243.
Mission of the Twelve, the, 75 sqq., 83.
Mnemonic devices, xiv sq.
Mockery by the Soldiers, the, 229 sq.
Most High God, the, 65.
Mystery of the Kingdom, 48, 51 sq.
  of the Loaves, 105 sqq.

Oral traditions
  about Jesus, xii sqq.
  of the Pharisees, 92 sqq.

Parables, 44, 46 sqq., 58 sq.
Parable of the Fruit-bearing Earth, 55 sqq.
  of the Mustard Seed, 57 sqq.
  of the Sower, 49 sq., 52 sqq.
  of the Wicked Husbandmen, 160 sqq.
Paralytic at Capernaum, the, 23 sqq.
Passion, predictions of the, lii, 108 sqq., 113, 125, 142 sq.
Passover, 194 sq., 200 sqq., 203 sqq., 262 sqq.
Paulinism of the Gospel, the alleged, xliii sqq.
Persecution anticipated, 184 sqq.
  at Rome, Nero's, xvi sq.
Peter, S., in relation to the Gospel, xxiii, xxv sqq.
Pilate, Jesus before, 225 sq.
Preaching, the earliest Christian, xi sqq.
Pre-literary stage of tradition, xiv sq.

'Q', the question of Mk's knowledge of, xxxviii sqq.

Rank and precedence among Christians, 146 sqq.
Refusal, the Great, 137 sqq.
Request of the Sons of Zebedee, 143 sqq.
Resurrection, doctrine of, 167 sqq.
Resurrection of Jesus, the, 243 sqq., 269 sqq.
Roman origin of the Gospel, xvi, xxiv sqq.

Sabbath, 32 sqq.
  healing on the, 35 sqq.
Sacraments, 145.
  see also *s. vv.* Baptism, Eucharist, Unction.
Sadducees, 92, 167 sqq., 265 sq.
Sanhedrin, Jesus examined before the, 216 sqq.
Sayings, Catenae of, 54 sq., 114 sqq., 129 sqq.
Scribal tradition, 91 sqq.
Scribes, 23 sqq., 29, 93 sqq., 123, 175 sq.
Secrecy, injunctions of, 258 sqq.
Servant of the Lord, 110, 147, 206, 254 sqq.
Shechinah, 120.
'Sign', demand for a, 105, 257 sq.
Simon's wife's mother, 17 sq.
Sinners, attitude of Jesus towards, 28 sqq., 45.
Soldiers, mockery by the, 229 sq.
Son, used absolutely, 192.
Son of David, li, 148 sq., 150 sqq., 173 sqq., 254 sq.
Son of God, li, 4, 8 sqq., 17, 38, 65, 254.
Son of Man, xxxiii, li sq., liii sq., 24 sq., 34, 44, 113 sqq., 125, 142, 146, 181, 189 sqq., 255.
Storm, stilling of the, 59 sqq.
Supper, the Last, 202 sqq., 262 sqq.
Synagogue at Capernaum, the, 15 sqq.
Syrophoenician Woman, the, 97 sqq.

Temple, the, 182 sq.
  cleansing of the, 155 sqq.
Temptation, the, 11 sq.
Time of the End, Mystery of the, 191 sqq.
Transfiguration, the, 116 sqq.

Trial of Jesus, 217 sqq.
Tribulation, the Great, xvii, 186 sqq.
Tribute-money, the, 164 sqq.
Triumphal Entry, the, 150 sqq.
Twelve, the, xlii sq., 38 sqq., 75 sqq.

Unction, 78.
Unwashen hands, 91 sqq.
Urmarcus, xxxvi sqq., xlii, 51, 123.

Virgin Birth, 46, 73 sq.

Walking on the Water, the, 87 sqq.
Wealth in relation to the Kingdom, 139 sqq.
Widow's mites, the, 176 sqq.
Woman with the Issue, the, 67 sqq.
Women who beheld, the, 239 sqq.

Young Man who fled, the, 215 sq.

Zealots, 41, 165.

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY FREDERICK HALL

A SELECTION
FROM
MESSRS. METHUEN'S
CATALOGUE
OF
GENERAL LITERATURE

A SELECTION OF

MESSRS. METHUEN'S PUBLICATIONS

This Catalogue contains only a selection of the more important books published by Messrs. Methuen. A complete catalogue of their publications may be obtained on application.

PART I. GENERAL LITERATURE

Armstrong (W. W.)
The Art of Cricket. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s. net.*

Bain (F. W.)
A Digit of the Moon. The Descent of the Sun. A Heifer of the Dawn. In the Great God's Hair. A Draught of the Blue. An Essence of the Dusk. An Incarnation of the Snow. A Mine of Faults. The Ashes of a God. Bubbles of the Foam. A Syrup of the Bees. The Livery of Eve. The Substance of a Dream. *All Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.* An Echo of the Spheres. *Wide Demy* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

Baker (C. H. Collins)
Crome. Illustrated. *Quarto.* £5 5*s. net.*

Balfour (Sir Graham)
The Life of Robert Louis Stevenson. *Twentieth Edition. In one Volume. Cr.* 8*vo. Buckram,* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Belloc (Hilaire)
Paris. The Pyrenees. *Each* 8*s.* 6*d. net.* On Nothing. Hills and the Sea. *Each* 3*s.* 6*d. net.* On Everything. On Something. First and Last. This and That and the Other. On. On Anything. *Each* 6*s. net.* Marie Antoinette. 18*s. net.* A History of England. In 4 vols. Vol. I, to 1066. 15*s.* net.

Birmingham (George A.)
A Wayfarer in Hungary. Illustrated. *Crown* 8*vo.* 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

Bowen (Frank C.)
The King's Navy. Illustrated. *Fcap.* 4*to.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Campbell (Olwen Ward)
Shelley and the Unromantics. Illustrated. *Second Edition, Revised. Demy* 8*vo.* 16*s. net.*

Chandler (Arthur), D.D., late Lord Bishop of Bloemfontein
Ara Cœli. 5*s. net.* Faith and Experi-

ence. 5s. *net.* The Cult of the Passing Moment. 6s. *net.* The English Church and Reunion. 5s. *net.* Scala Mundi. 4s. 6*d. net.*

Chesterton (G. K.)
The Ballad of the White Horse. All Things Considered. Tremendous Trifles. Alarms and Discursions. A Miscellany of Men. The Uses of Diversity. Fancies versus Fads. *All Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6s. *net.* Charles Dickens. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 3s. 6*d. net.* Wine, Water, and Song. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1s. 6*d. net.*

Childe (C. P.)
Cancer and the Public. *Demy* 8*vo.* 10s. 6*d. net.*

Clutton-Brock (A.)
What is the Kingdom of Heaven? Essays on Art. Shakespeare's Hamlet. *Each* 5s. *net.* Essays on Books. More Essays on Books. *Each* 6s. *net.* Shelley, the Man and the Poet. 7s. 6*d. net.*

Cowling (George H.)
A Preface to Shakespeare. Illustrated. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5s. *net.*

Dark (Sidney) and Grey (Rowland)
W. S. Gilbert: His Life and Letters. *Second Edition. Demy* 8*vo.* 15s. *net.*

Dolls' House (The Queen's)
The Book of the Queen's Dolls' House. Vol. I. The House, Edited by A. C. Benson, C.V.O., and Sir Lawrence Weaver, K.B.E. Vol. II. The Library, Edited by E. V. Lucas. Profusely Illustrated. A Limited Edition. *Crown* 4*to.* £6 6s. *net.*
Everybody's Book of the Queen's Dolls' House. An abridged edition of the above. Illustrated. *Crown* 4*to.* 5s. *net.*

Edwardes (Tickner)
The Lore of the Honeybee. *Thirteenth Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 7s. 6*d. net.* Beekeeping for All. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3s. 6*d. net.* The Bee-Master of Warrilow. *Third Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 7s. 6*d. net.* All Illustrated.

Einstein (Albert)
Relativity: The Special and General Theory. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5s. *net.* Sidelights on Relativity. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3s. 6*d. net.* The Meaning of Relativity. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5s. *net.*

Other books on the **Einstein Theory**
An Introduction to the Theory of Relativity. By Lyndon Bolton. *Crown* 8*vo.* 5s. *net.*
The Principle of Relativity. By A. Einstein, H. A. Lorentz, H. Minkowski and H. Weyl. With Notes by A. Sommerfeld. *Demy* 8*vo.* 12s. 6*d. net.*

Write for Complete Lists

Evans (Joan)
English Jewellery. *Royal* 4*to.* £2 12s. 6*d. net.*

Fitzgerald (Edward)
The Ruba'iyat of Omar Khayyam. Illustrated by Edmund J. Sullivan. *Wide Crown* 8*vo.* 10s. 6*d. net.*

Forrest (H. Edward)
The Old Houses of Stratford-upon-Avon. Illustrated. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7s. 6*d. net.*

Freundlich (H.)
Colloid and Capillary Chemistry. *Royal* 8*vo.* £1 16s. *net.*

Fyleman (Rose)
Fairies and Chimneys. The Fairy Green. The Fairy Flute. The Rainbow Cat. Eight Little Plays for Children. Forty Good-night Tales. *Each* 3s. 6*d. net.* A Small Cruse, 4s. 6*d. net.* The Rose Fyleman Fairy Book. Illustrated. *Crown* 4*to.* 10s. 6*d. net.*

Gibbon (Edward)
The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. With Notes, Appendixes, and Maps, by J. B. Bury. Illustrated. Seven volumes. *Demy* 8*vo.* 15s. *net* each volume. Also, unillustrated, *Crown* 8*vo.* 7s. 6*d. net* each volume.

Glover (T. R.)
The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire. Poets and Puritans. From Pericles to Philip. Virgil. *Each* 10s. 6*d. net.*

Gotch (J. A.)
Old English Houses. Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo.* 16s. *net.*

Graham (Harry)
THE WORLD WE LAUGH IN: More Deportmental Ditties. Illustrated by "FISH." *Fifth Edition. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

Grahame (Kenneth)
THE WIND IN THE WILLOWS. *Seventeenth Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.* Also, Illustrated by NANCY BARNHART. *Small* 4*to.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

Hadfield (J. A.)
PSYCHOLOGY AND MORALS. *Fifth Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s. net.*

Hall (H. R.)
THE ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE NEAR EAST. *Sixth Edition, Revised. Demy* 8*vo.* £1 1*s. net.*

Hamer (Sir W. H.), and Hutt (C. W.)
A MANUAL OF HYGIENE. Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo.* £1 5*s. net.*

Hind (A. M.)
A CATALOGUE OF REMBRANDT'S ETCHINGS. Two Vols. Profusely Illustrated. *Wide Royal* 8*vo.* £1 15*s. net.*

Holdsworth (W. S.)
A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LAW. Seven Volumes. *Demy* 8*vo.* £1 5*s. net each.*

Hudson (W. H.)
A SHEPHERD'S LIFE. Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.* Also, unillustrated, *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

Hutton (Edward)
MILAN AND LOMBARDY. THE CITIES OF ROMAGNA AND THE MARCHES. SIENA AND SOUTHERN TUSCANY. VENICE AND VENETIA. THE CITIES OF SPAIN. NAPLES AND SOUTHERN ITALY. Illustrated. *Each,* 8*s.* 6*d. net.* A WAYFARER IN UNKNOWN TUSCANY. THE CITIES OF UMBRIA. COUNTRY WALKS ABOUT FLORENCE. ROME. FLORENCE AND NORTHERN TUSCANY. Illustrated. *Each,* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Imms (A. D.)
A GENERAL TEXTBOOK OF ENTOMOLOGY. Illustrated. *Royal* 8*vo.* £1 16*s. net.*

Inge (W. R.), D.D., Dean of St. Paul's
CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM. (The Bampton Lectures of 1899.) *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Jenks (Edward)
AN OUTLINE OF ENGLISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT. *Sixth Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.* A SHORT HISTORY OF ENGLISH LAW. *Third Edition,* Revised to 1919. *Demy* 8*vo.* 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Kipling (Rudyard)
BARRACK-ROOM BALLADS. 233*rd Thousand.*

THE SEVEN SEAS. 172*nd Thousand.*

THE FIVE NATIONS. 138*th Thousand.*

DEPARTMENTAL DITTIES. 111*th Thousand.*

THE YEARS BETWEEN. 95*th Thousand.*
Four Editions of these famous volumes of poems are now published, viz.:—*Crown* 8*vo. Buckram,* 7*s.* 6*d. net. Fcap.* 8vo. *Cloth,* 6*s. net. Leather,* 7*s.* 6*d. net.* Service Edition. Two volumes each book. *Square Fcap.* 8*vo.* 3*s. net* each volume.

A KIPLING ANTHOLOGY—Verse. *Fcap.* 8*vo. Cloth,* 6*s. net. Leather,* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

TWENTY POEMS FROM RUDYARD KIPLING. 408*th Thousand. Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s. net.*

A CHOICE OF SONGS. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s. net.*

Lamb (Charles and Mary)
THE COMPLETE WORKS. Edited by E. V. LUCAS. A New and Revised Edition in Six Volumes. With Frontispieces. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 6*s. net each.*
The volumes are: I. MISCELLANEOUS PROSE. II. ELIA AND THE LAST ESSAYS OF ELIA. III. BOOKS FOR CHILDREN. IV. PLAYS AND POEMS. V. and VI. LETTERS.

SELECTED LETTERS. Chosen and Edited by G. T. CLAPTON. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

Lankester (Sir Ray)
SCIENCE FROM AN EASY CHAIR. SCIENCE FROM AN EASY CHAIR: Second Series. DIVERSIONS OF A NATURALIST. GREAT AND SMALL THINGS. Illustrated. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.* SECRETS OF EARTH AND SEA. Illustrated. *Crown* 8*vo.* 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

Lodge (Sir Oliver)
Man and the Universe (*Twentieth Edition*). The Survival of Man (*Seventh Edition*). *Each Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.* Raymond (*Twelfth Edition*). *Demy 8vo.* 10*s.* 6*d. net.* Raymond Revised. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s. net.*

Lucas (E. V.)
The Life of Charles Lamb. 2 Vols. £1 1*s. net.* Edwin Austin Abbey, R.A. 2 Vols. £6 6*s. net.* Vermeer of Delft. 10*s.* 6*d. net.* A Wanderer in Holland. A Wanderer in London. London Revisited, 1925. A Wanderer in Paris. A Wanderer in Florence. A Wanderer in Venice. *Each* 10*s.* 6*d. net.* A Wanderer among Pictures. 8*s.* 6*d. net.* The Open Road. 6*s. net.* Also, illustrated by Claude A. Shepperson. 10*s.* 6*d. net.* Also, India Paper. *Leather*, 7*s.* 6*d. net.* The Friendly Town. Fireside and Sunshine. Character and Comedy. *Each* 6*s. net.* The Gentlest Art. 6*s.* 6*d. net.* The Second Post. Her Infinite Variety. Good Company. One Day and Another. Old Lamps for New. Loiterer's Harvest. Cloud and Silver. A Boswell of Baghdad. 'Twixt Eagle and Dove. The Phantom Journal. Giving and Receiving. Luck of the Year. Encounters and Diversions. Zig-Zags in France. *Each* 6*s. net.* Specially Selected. Urbanities. *Each*, illustrated by G. L. Stampa, 7*s.* 6*d. net.* You Know What People Are. Illustrated by George Morrow. 5*s. net.* The Same Star: A Comedy in Three Acts. 3*s.* 6*d. net.* The British School. 6*s. net.* Little Books on Great Masters. *Each* 5*s. net.* Roving East and Roving West. 5*s. net.* See also **Dolls' House (The Queen's).**

Lynd (Robert)
The Blue Lion. The Peal of Bells. An Anthology of Modern Prose. *Each Fcap. 8vo.* 6*s. net.*

McDougall (William)
An Introduction to Social Psychology (*Nineteenth Edition*), 8*s.* 6*d. net.* National Welfare and National Decay. 6*s. net.* An Outline of Psychology. 12*s. net.* Body and Mind (*Fifth Edition*). 12*s.* 6*d. net.* Ethics and Some Modern World Problems. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Maeterlinck (Maurice)
The Blue Bird. 6*s. net.* Also, illustrated by F. Cayley Robinson. 10*s.* 6*d. net.* Mary Magdalene. 5*s. net.* Death. 3*s.* 6*d. net.* Our Eternity. 6*s. net.* The Unknown Guest. 6*s. net.* Poems. 5*s. net.* The Wrack of the Storm. 6*s net.* The Miracle of St. Anthony. 3*s.* 6*d. net.* The Burgomaster of Stilemonde. 5*s. net.* The Betrothal. 6*s. net.* Mountain Paths. 6*s. net.* The Story of Tyltyl. £1 1*s. net.* The Great Secret. 7*s.* 6*d. net.* The Cloud that Lifted and The Power of the Dead. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Masefield (John)
On the Spanish Main. 8*s.* 6*d. net.* A Sailor's Garland. 6*s. net.* Sea Life in Nelson's Time. 5*s. net.*

Methuen (Sir A.)
An Anthology of Modern Verse. 82*nd Thousand.*
Shakespeare to Hardy: An Anthology of English Lyrics. 15*th Thousand.* *Each Fcap. 8vo. Cloth*, 6*s. net.* *Leather*, 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Milne (A. A.)
Not that it Matters. If I May. *Each* 6*s. net.* When We were Very Young. Illustrated by E. H. Shepard. *Ninth Edition.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.* *Leather*, 10*s.* 6*d. net.* For the Luncheon Interval: Cricket and Other Verses. 1*s.* 6*d. net.*

Milne (A. A.) and Fraser-Simson (H.)
Fourteen Songs from "When We were Very Young." Words by A. A. Milne. Music by H. Fraser-Simson. *Fourth Edition. Royal 4to.* 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Newman (Tom)
How to Play Billiards. Illustrated. *Crown 8vo.* 8*s.* 6*d. net.* Billiard Do's and Dont's. 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

Oman (Sir Charles)
A History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages, A.D. 378–1485. *Second Edition*, Revised and Enlarged. 2 Vols. Illustrated. *Demy 8vo.* £1 16*s. net.*

Oxenham (John)
Bees in Amber. *Small Pott 8vo.* 2*s. net.* All's Well. The King's Highway. The Vision Splendid. The Fiery Cross. High Altars. Hearts

Courageous. All Clear! *Each Small Pott 8vo. Paper,* 1*s.* 3*d. net. Cloth,* 2*s. net.* Winds of the Dawn. 2*s. net.*

Perry (W. J.)
The Origin of Magic and Religion. The Growth of Civilization. *Each* 6*s. net.* The Children of the Sun. 18*s. net.*

Petrie (Sir Flinders)
A History of Egypt. In 6 Volumes.

Vol. I. From the Ist to the XVIth Dynasty. *Eleventh Edition, Revised.* 12*s. net.*

Vol. II. The XVIIth and XVIIIth Dynasties. *Seventh Edition, Revised.* 9*s. net.*

Vol. III. XIXth to XXXth Dynasties. *Third Edition.* 12*s. net.*

Vol. IV. Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty. J. P. Mahaffy. *Second Edition.* 9*s. net.*

Vol. V. Egypt under Roman Rule. J. G. Milne. *Third Edition, Revised.* 12*s. net.*

Vol. VI. Egypt in the Middle Ages. Stanley Lane Poole. *Fourth Edition.* 10*s. net.*

Raleigh (Sir Walter)
The Letters of Sir Walter Raleigh. Edited by Lady Raleigh. Two Vols. *Demy* 8*vo.* £1 5*s. net.*

Rice-Oxley (L.)
Oxford Renowned. Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo.* 18*s. net.*

Rutter (Owen)
The New Baltic States and their Future: An Account of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Illustrated. *Demy* 8*vo.* 15*s. net.*

Smith (Adam)
The Wealth of Nations. Edited by Edwin Cannan. 2 Vols. *Demy* 8*vo.* £1 5*s. net.*

Smith (C. Fox)
Sailor Town Days. Sea Songs and Ballads. A Book of Famous Ships. Ship Alley. *Each,* illustrated, 6*s. net.* The Return of the "Cutty Sark." Illustrated. 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

Sommerfeld (Arnold)
Atomic Structure and Spectral Lines. *Demy* 8*vo.* £1 12*s. net.*

Stevens (F. E.)
The New Forest Beautiful. Illustrated. *Crown* 8*vo.* 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

Stevenson (R. L.)
The Letters. Edited by Sir Sidney Colvin. 4 Vols. *Fcap.* 8*vo. Each* 6*s. net.*

Stratton (F. J. M.)
Astronomical Physics. *Demy* 8*vo.* 15*s net..*

Surtees (R. S.)
Handley Cross. Mr. Sponge's Sporting Tour. Ask Mamma. Mr. Facey Romford's Hounds. Plain or Ringlets? Hillingdon Hall. *Each,* illustrated, 7*s.* 6*d. net.* Jorrocks's Jaunts and Jollities. Hawbuck Grange. *Each,* illustrated, 6*s. net.*

Thomson (J. Arthur)
What is Man? 6*s.* 6*d. net.* Science and Religion. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Tilden (W. T.)
The Art of Lawn Tennis. Singles and Doubles. *Each,* illustrated, 6*s. net.* The Common Sense of Lawn Tennis. Illustrated. 5*s. net.*

Tileston (Mary W.)
Daily Strength for Daily Needs. 31*st Edition.* 3*s.* 6*d. net. India Paper Leather,* 6*s. net.*

Underhill (Evelyn)
Mysticism (*Tenth Edition*). 15*s. net,* The Life of the Spirit and the Life of To-day (*Sixth Edition*). 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

Vardon (Harry)
How to Play Golf. Illustrated. 18*th Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. net.*

Waterhouse (Elizabeth)
A Little Book of Life and Death. 22*nd Edition. Small Pott* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

Wilde (Oscar).
The Works. In 16 Vols. *Each* 6*s*. 6*d*. *net*.

I. Lord Arthur Savile's Crime and the Portrait of Mr. W. H. II. The Duchess of Padua. III. Poems. IV. Lady Windermere's Fan. V. A Woman of No Importance. VI. An Ideal Husband. VII. The Importance of Being Earnest. VIII. A House of Pomegranates. IX. Intentions. X. De Profundis and Prison Letters. XI. Essays. XII Salome, A Florentine Tragedy, and La Sainte Courtisane. XIII. A Critic in Pall Mall. XIV. Selected Prose of Oscar Wilde. XV. Art and Decoration. XVI. For Love of the King. 5*s*. *net*.

PART II. A SELECTION OF SERIES

The Antiquary's Books
Each, illustrated, *Demy* 8*vo*. 10*s*. 6*d*. *net*. A series of volumes dealing with various branches of English Antiquities, comprehensive and popular, as well as accurate and scholarly.

The Arden Shakespeare
Edited by W. J. Craig and R. H. Case. *Each*, *wide Demy* 8*vo*. 6*s*. *net*.
The Ideal Library Edition, in single plays, each edited with a full Introduction, Textual Notes and a Commentary at the foot of the page. Now complete in 39 Vols.

Classics of Art
Edited by J. H. W. Laing. *Each*, profusely illustrated, *wide Royal* 8*vo*. 15*s*. *net to* £3 3*s*. *net*.
A Library of Art dealing with Great Artists and with branches of Art.

The "Complete" Series
Demy 8*vo*. Fully illustrated.
Airman. 16*s*. *net*. Amateur Boxer. 10*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Athletic Trainer. 10*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Billiard Player. 10*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Cook. 10*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Foxhunter. 16*s*. *net*. Golfer. 12*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Hockey Player. 10*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Horseman. 15*s*. *net*. Jujitsuan (*Cr*. 8*vo*.). 5*s*. *net*. Lawn Tennis Player. 12*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Motorist. 10*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Mountaineer. 18*s*. *net*. Oarsman. 12*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Photographer. 12*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Rugby Footballer, on the New Zealand System. 12*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Shot. 16*s*. *net*. Swimmer. 10*s*. 6*d*. *net*. Yachtsman. 15*s*. *net*.

The Connoisseur's Library
With numerous Illustrations. Wide Royal 8*vo*. £1 11*s*. 6*d*. *net each vol*.
English Coloured Books. Etchings. European Enamels. Fine Books. Glass. Goldsmiths' and Silversmiths' Work. Illuminated Manuscripts. Ivories. Jewellery. Mezzotints. Miniatures. Porcelain. Seals. Wood Sculpture.

The Do's and Dont's Series
Fcap. 8*vo*. 2*s*. 6*d*. *net each*.
This series, although only in its infancy, is already famous. In due course it will comprise clear, crisp, informative volumes on all the activities of life.
Write for full list

The Library of Devotion
Handy editions of the great Devotional books, well edited. *Small Pott* 8*vo*. 3*s*. *net and* 3*s*. 6*d*. *net*.

Little Books on Art
Well Illustrated. *Demy* 16*mo*. *Each* 5*s*. *net*.

Modern Masterpieces
In sets of six. *Fcap*. 8*vo*. 3*s*. 6*d*. *each volume*.
Pocketable Editions of Works by A. A. Milne, Joseph Conrad, Arnold Bennett, G. K. Chesterton, E. V. Lucas and Hilaire Belloc.

Sport Series
Mostly Illustrated. *Fcap*. 8*vo*. 2*s*. *net to* 5*s*. *net each*.
Handy books on all branches of sport by experts.

Methuen's Half-Crown Library
Crown 8vo. and Fcap. 8vo.

Methuen's Two Shilling Library
Fcap. 8vo.

Two series of cheap editions of popular books.

Write for complete lists

The Westminster Commentaries
Demy 8vo. 8s. 6d. net to 16s. net.
Edited by W. LOCK, D.D. The object of these commentaries is primarily to interpret the author's meaning to the present generation, taking the English text in the Revised Version as their basis.

THE LITTLE GUIDES

Small Pott 8vo. Illustrated and with Maps

4s. net mostly

THE 62 VOLUMES IN THE SERIES ARE:—

BEDFORDSHIRE AND HUNTINGDONSHIRE
BERKSHIRE
BRITTANY
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE
CAMBRIDGE AND COLLEGES
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
CATHEDRAL CITIES OF ENGLAND AND WALES 6*s*. net
CHANNEL ISLANDS 5*s*. net
CHESHIRE 5*s*. net
CORNWALL
CUMBERLAND AND WESTMORLAND 6*s*. net
DERBYSHIRE
DEVON
DORSET 5*s*. 6*d*. net
DURHAM
ENGLISH LAKES 6*s*. net
ESSEX
GLOUCESTERSHIRE
HAMPSHIRE
HEREFORDSHIRE 4*s*. 6*d*. net
HERTFORDSHIRE
ISLE OF MAN
ISLE OF WIGHT
KENT 5*s*. net
KERRY
LANCASHIRE 6*s*. net
LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND 5*s*. net
LINCOLNSHIRE 6*s*. net
LINCOLN'S INN AND GRAY'S INN 4*s*. net
LONDON
MALVERN COUNTRY
MIDDLESEX
MONMOUTHSHIRE
NORFOLK
NORMANDY 5*s*. net
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE
NORTHUMBERLAND 5*s*. net
NORTH WALES 6*s*. net
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE
OXFORD AND COLLEGES
OXFORDSHIRE
ROME 5*s*. net
ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL
SHAKESPEARE'S COUNTRY
SHROPSHIRE
SICILY
SNOWDONIA 6*s*. net
SOMERSET
SOUTH WALES
STAFFORDSHIRE 5*s*. net
SUFFOLK
SURREY
SUSSEX
TEMPLE
WARWICKSHIRE 5*s*. net
WESTMINSTER ABBEY
WILTSHIRE
WORCESTERSHIRE 6*s*. net
YORKSHIRE EAST RIDING 5*s*. net
YORKSHIRE NORTH RIDING
YORKSHIRE WEST RIDING 7*s*. 6*d*. net
YORK 6*s*. net

DATE DUE

DEC 28 '89
DEC 30 '91
JAN 22 1995
APR 14 1995
DEC 22 1995
DEC 20 1997
MAR 24 2000
MAY 19 2007

HIGHSMITH #LO-45220

BS 2585 .R261 1925

Bible.

St. Mark

BS 2585 .R261 1925 78790

Bible.

St. Mark

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00002183